

'dried-up wells, cracked fields and emaciated men.'

India is cannibalising her total resources for the purchase and production of arms. Bombay's *Indian Express* disclosed that even natural gas is being 'recklessly destroyed in India just because the special type of steel needed to make cylinders to harness this gas for industrial purposes is being used for armaments manufacture'. In the same indulgent way, India is channelising foreign economic aid into defence and military preparations. Seven Republican members of the American House Foreign Affairs Committee have strongly objected to 'India's massive arms buildup' which they think is being made possible by 'massive American economic assistance'. They also wonder 'to what extent our aid to India is in effect subsidizing that country's purchase of Soviet arms' and to what extent 'the arms buildup by India will upset that country's delicate balance with Pakistan which is so important to peace in Asia'. Both the United States and Soviet Russia are 'deeply concerned and disgusted over the misuse and wastage of their economic aid to India' but both of them are perhaps unwilling or powerless to persuade India to mend her relations with China and Pakistan.

### *Tangible Targets*

An American journal has accused Indian leaders of using Kashmir as a "chauvinistic vehicle fuelled by jingoism, militarism and religious passions". They have spread the scare that even an indication of a plebiscite in Kashmir will spark communal riots in India—and the worst sufferers will be the Muslims. The fear might not have been so unfounded if perfect communal peace

had prevailed in India after independence. But, since 1947, has there been a day without communal disturbances? The argument tends to mean that the people of Kashmir have to uphold Indian right to rule them not only to prove their but Indian Muslims' loyalty to India. The Kashmiris must continue to writhe under subjugation for the sake of their multitudinous Muslim brethren in India. If they opt for Pakistan, they will not only be confirmed as anti-Indian but will be held guilty of destroying the allegiance of Indian Muslims. What one section of Muslims decides to do will be taken as the general opinion of all the Muslims in India. What an exercise in excruciation? Is it a test of loyalty or threat of lynching? Are 80-million Indian Muslims condemned to live as awe-struck hostages and serve as helots of Hindu overlords? India's defence case has found no audience because there are more serious challenges to Indian unity than Kashmir. One of the appealing explanations is that, if India agrees to a settlement of the Kashmir dispute and, in case of a plebiscite, the people of Kashmir vote for Pakistan, it would mean an implicit recognition of Pakistan as a sovereign state in the subcontinent. Thus, the heart of the conflict is not Kashmir but Pakistan. During the turbulent days, following the Maharaja's accession to India, Gandhi prescribed that the proper course for his country was 'not merely to give fight in Kashmir but to attack Pakistan itself and to march to Karachi.'

"Most of India's millions", says an American newspaper columnist, "do not give a hoot about Kashmir. What are the four million Kashmiris to the country that

gains as many new babies every 75 days? What is the strip of mountain-locked land only 26 by 60 miles in a subcontinent as vast as India? Kashmir that India's politicians talk about is *a symbol of India's frustration and resentment that the subcontinent was ever divided in the first place . . .*" Indian leaders continue to whip the enthusiasm of Hindu masses for a common nationality and never cease to consider Pakistan as an artificial creation, a temporary phase, a passing episode in the history of India's struggle for independence—and unity. How profoundly it is true is borne out by India's refusal, after partition, to treat Pakistan as one of the successor states in the subcontinent; at one stage, Nehru was not even prepared to negotiate with Pakistan as it had no *locus standi* in the Kashmir dispute! When Nehru stated that the people of Kashmir had challenged Pakistan's two-nation theory, he was just being a victim of vanity as he wanted to have the pleasure of holding a Muslim majority area against the principles of partition. Sheikh Abdullah's earlier lament was that the suffering of Kashmiri people was a by-product of enmity between India and Pakistan. He must have realised that this power struggle is not confined to the Kashmir landscape; if India is able to cow down Pakistan and make her subservient to New Delhi, the people both in Pakistan and Kashmir are in danger of losing their freedom.

### *Wild Goose Chase*

Inflated with military pride, encouraged by Security Council's flexible stance and emboldened by super-powers' new preferences in Asia, India has declared

Kashmir a closed chapter. The other day Mrs. Indira Gandhi said that Tashkent Declaration did not warrant any discussion on Kashmir. She appears to be the modern edition of her name-sake, the Hindu god Indira, who could assume any shape or form or countenance he liked—depending on the nature of the peril or needs of the hour. When the Indo-Pakistan war was on and the Security Council adopted a resolution calling for a cease-fire and settlement of the Kashmir dispute, the Indian representative hastened to accept it without a moment's hesitation. Now her Minister for External Affairs has repudiated Indian obligations under the Security Council's resolution by pointing out that 'India had accepted it conditionally and not as a whole'. The Maharaja's conditional accession to India did not prevent her from declaring it as 'final and irrevocable' because she had no intention of giving up Kashmir, but her instant acceptance of Security Council's resolution of September 20 has become conditional because, as always in the past, she had no intention of abiding by its terms. All these years, India has engaged us in dismantling obstacles erected by her political masons. It has been a sickening search for any formula to which she would respond favourably. They try to avoid a final breakdown but like to maintain a stalemate. It is an astounding story of pledges and denials, confirmations and contradictions, assurances and rebuttals. As each resolution of the Security Council was softened, India's resolve to hold on to Kashmir stiffened. When a proposal is submitted, they come out immediately with a counter-proposal; when they feel that it has a chance of being accepted, they are ready with a counter-counter-proposal.

It has never been a straight reply but always an oblique oration. How can you have a working equation with a party which not only disagrees with the obvious inference but disputes the facts? They even refuse to accept the interpretation given by the framers of a resolution. In fact they present a garbled version of their own first interpretation to ensure that an authorised version is never in sight. Indians would like their formula to mean all things to all men; is it practising intellectual subtleties or is it downright deception? In 1948, when Pakistan pleaded for a little time to prepare its brief, the Indian representative shouted at the members of the Security Council and demanded immediate settlement of the Kashmir dispute as 'the situation does not brook delay'. India's Bajpai warned that 'the sands of time are running out; if the problem is not resolved by reason, the sword will find the solution'. Today, we all realize that India has been merely playing for time and dealing with the United Nations not to seek a solution but to reinforce her occupancy of Kashmir and conduct a tirade against Pakistan.

### *UN And Superpowers*

Nehru was always very keen 'to increase the prestige of the United Nations'. His daughter is equally concerned "over a tendency to 'churn out' resolutions whose implementation was doubtful, since that was undermining the authority of the whole decision-making machinery of the United Nations." But, in spite of her declared devotion to UN ideals, India's defiance of Security Council's resolutions on Kashmir was a deadly

blow to the new international forum. It is true that the Security Council, as an executive organ of United Nations, is not a court of law, but it is the only adjudicating body available to the aggrieved parties. Despite its congenital deficiency and defects, the United Nations was considered indispensable for the maintenance of world peace. What is more, in the beginning, its response to petitions was heartening and it held out new hope for mankind. Kashmir was one of the first disputes brought to its bar; in spite of repeated breaches of faith by India, the members of the Security Council did not fail to grasp the essence of self-determination for Kashmir and demonstrated "the United Nations' will to exercise its moral authority backed by an overwhelming world opinion." As it advanced in years, the United Nations began to betray signs of age and developed a senile apathy towards urgent world issues. For the smaller powers, it has already slid into despair and bankruptcy. It is a cynical defence of UN to say that it was created not to get us to heaven but to prevent us from going to hell. In other words, the contending parties should rejoice in a state of suspense if they do not want the dispute to be consumed by the corroding processes of time. All agree that the UN is 'badly in need of a new lift and a new leadership' but, frankly, has it any existence outside the superpowers who use it both as a pawn and power to promote their global interests? Thus, if there is a dispute between two small nations, it is bound to die unless it has real attractiveness for one of the big protecting powers. The world's small states hold majority membership of the United Nations but their manoeuvrability is confined to the freedom

and pleasure of speeches and statements. Let them roar with pain or rattle the sabre but no action can be expected unless one of the superpowers is seriously committed to support a satellite. It is a privilege without power; they have the right to talk without hope of a reward; they have a platform for performance but no promise of redress. In fact, the representatives of these puny small states are seldom made to feel scared; let them attack and abuse the world organization but, strangely enough, the surest guarantee of UN survival is the unfailing function of big powers to act as watchdogs and shock-absorbers.

But, can we welcome it as a relieving feature when we know that big power politics "whether as an instrument of nationalism or of ideological extremism, is the natural enemy of international order as envisaged in the UN Charter"? The present UN Secretary-General often hits out against both the superpowers; he is plagued by constant conscience pangs because he must be pained to see that the success or failure of United Nations in a given dispute is always a mirror of power politics at a given moment. When Kashmir became a victim of cold war in the early fifties, many were distressed to find that this human problem was being unnecessarily projected into the context of world politics. Today, the scene has shifted; the old spirit of rivalry is gone; and some smell a conspiracy among the superpowers 'to substitute an irresistible condominium for the perilous competition between them.' Philosophers Bertrand Russell and Jean Paul Sartre, historian Vladimir Dedijer and mathematician Laurent Schwartz warned in a letter

to *The Times*: "We have reason to believe, on the basis of prima facie evidence, that the United States and the Soviet Union are enacting an understanding which involves reciprocal support for the crimes of each in its agreed sphere of influence. The secret diplomacy of the rulers of United States and of the Soviet Union threatens the liberty and sovereignty of men everywhere."

Perhaps in no region of the world is collaboration between superpowers more evident than in the sub-continent. India has refused to sign the nuclear non-proliferation treaty; India has refused to bend her steps in Kashmir; India has refused to make it up with Pakistan but 'the continued supply of arms and economic aid to India by Russia and America is a proof that the Indian actions will not be made a ground to deprive it of their support.' They cannot think of coercing India because India is a Sacred Cow. "Somehow this is true", said an American Congressman, "despite India's record of pillage in the religious wars, despite India's aggression against Goa, despite India's record of persecution of the so-called untouchables and despite India's record of political tyranny in denying self-determination to Kashmir." On the other hand Pakistan has been warned that 'Kashmir cannot be wrested from India by force' and 'the unanimity so far preserved by the Security Council should convince her that she can no longer play upon big power differences'.

In 1948, the American member of the Security Council almost broke down as he spoke in an emotion-choked voice, exposed India's dilatory devices and insisted

on an expeditious solution of the Kashmir dispute. In 1968, an official American spokesman says that his government 'regarded the problem as one concerning Pakistan and India', who should help themselves and find a solution. In 1948, the British member of the Security Council described Kashmir as 'the greatest and gravest single issue in international affairs'. In 1968, the British Foreign Minister disowned any responsibility in the matter because it was not for his country 'to meddle in this affair'. The Soviet Union would perhaps expect us to thank her for sponsoring the Tashkent meeting, giving up her pronouncedly pro-Indian stand and even deciding to supply some arms to Pakistan.

China became a nuclear power after her border war with India; it was a great opportunity for Indian diplomatists to embark on a 'gigantic blackmail'. India is sedulously maintaining, what may be called, a business enmity with China to secure all possible military aid and financial assistance from western countries. Having studied the chequered canvas of world politics, she has 'rationalised' her behaviour patterns towards the three superpowers. It has been well said that "India currently presents *three faces* to the world: one to the West, simulating a resolve to fight China in order to secure the maximum of western arms assistance; a second to the Soviet Union, stressing her resolve, nevertheless, to remain 'non-aligned'; and a third to China, seeking a peaceful settlement of the dispute by secret peace overtures through neutral emissaries." Like the Hindu mythology, the present day Indian foreign policy record is a mixture of parables and paradoxes but a common

trait of trinity is manifest in the old beliefs and new practices. According to the authors of Rigveda, the universe consists of three parts—heaven, air and earth. India's international posture is dictated by old deities who had their individual existence but performed triple duties. One of the glorious gods of Hindus was Agni about whom it is said that he was a triple-natured being. Another Hindu god had also three functions—to sway the firmament, to control the rain and fight the battles. With the dawn of Brahmanic era, three powerful gods emerged—Brahma, Vishnu and Siva. A product of Vedic age, Agni became the symbol and supporter of three powers—the sun, lightning and fire. Translated in modern terms, India treats herself as the sun and wants the smaller neighbours to become her satellites and bask in the sunshine of India's secularism; lightning symbolises outburst of communal frenzy which has led to mass killing of Muslims; the fire burning inside is the fire of hate.

#### *Amity or Enmity*

The old Hindu gods seem to have been reincarnated in today's India, though they have been cut to size and tailored to meet modern requirements. One of the triple-handed Hindu gods had an extra hidden arm; India's fourth arm is always raised to browbeat Pakistan. India's bearing vis-a-vis the world is three-dimensional but Pakistan constitutes the fourth dimension; to put it geometrically, it is a 'solid angle formed by three or more plane angles meeting at point'. The 'point' is Pakistan because all lines of their policy converge on Pakistan. Time has not taught them that they cannot efface Pakis-

tan; experience has not made them realise the sheer impossibility of living eternally as a sworn adversary of Pakistan. Can the two survive without amity or without enmity? What has polluted the atmosphere and dimmed the hope of Indo-Pakistan detente is not lack of opportunity but lack of goodwill. An abundant fund of goodwill will flow if India agrees to remove the simmering cauldron of Kashmir. Governments in India and Pakistan come and go but Kashmir remains the perennial problem. India does not revise her policy for fear of loss of prestige but her failure in changing her present stand might lead to a greater loss of prestige. As *Sunday Times* said, "the danger in Kashmir is fierce but opportunity is correspondingly great. India and Pakistan would never live in friendship until the canker of Kashmir is exorcized".

In order to make a show of their willingness to reconcile with Pakistan, Indian leaders make a periodic offer of a no-war pact. They are so fond of these trite gestures that they put a wishful construction on the terms of Tashkent Declaration and claimed that in agreeing not to have recourse to force, Pakistan had virtually signed a no-war pact with India. During his visit to the United States, a former President of India said that a no-war pact with Pakistan could be registered with the United Nations and thus give it 'international validity in law and in morality which it would not otherwise possess'. Has India shown any reverence to United Nations resolutions on Kashmir to justify our gesture in accepting the recommendation at its face value? Secondly, it is redundant to talk of no-war agreement when

both India and Pakistan are members of the United Nations and Article 23 of the Charter enjoins upon the parties to any dispute to seek a solution by all possible peaceful means at their disposal.

Thirdly, we have to remember that the desire for a no-war pact is born of the fear that war may break out any moment; every agreement that seeks to rule out the use of force is based on the assumption that there are disputes that can lead to an armed conflict. Thus the terms of such a pact must include a provision for the settlement of disputes. As Kashmir has become the keystone of India-Pakistan relations, there can be no prospects of peace without resolving this dispute. As Kashmir, like Hellen, is the 'beautiful cause' of all trouble, it must come first in the order of priorities. Explaining his views on India-Pakistan adjustments, Mr. Shastri once said that substantive talks could take place only in an atmosphere 'free from tension' and we should 'deal with irritants as effectively as possible so that discussions on major outstanding problems can be conducted more purposefully.' But, as Mr. Arshad Hussain, Pakistan's Foreign Minister, said: 'Experience has shown that agreements, even on peripheral issues, do not hold in the atmosphere of tension perpetuated by the continuance' of major disputes. In fact, we have also tasted the Indian recipe to work from the crust to the core of the problem; one of the most significant betrayal of Hindu mentality is their hesitation in settling the Berubari issue (five square miles of territory to be ceded to East Pakistan) when a decision for demarcation was taken in 1956. Fourthly, how can a no-war document ensure

Pakistan against Indian attack and aggression when they have always resorted to force and tried to coerce their smaller neighbours into submission. A no-war pact becomes utterly meaningless when they are not even prepared to consider the reduction of forces at a reasonable level. Like a parasitical, gluttonous worm, cushioned inside India's body-politic, defence continues to eat up large chunks of their national budget. Basically, it is a question of confidence and motives; Indian leaders can always change their mind if they feel strong enough to attack Pakistan. A pact of peace becomes a scrap of paper when there is lack of good intentions to honour a gentlemanly agreement.

### *Day of Reckoning*

Given good intentions, India should at least be tempted to come to the conference table and pursue the possibility of a compromise solution acceptable to her, to Pakistan and the people of Kashmir. But all efforts have failed to move India into meaningful talks. When the creed of 'peaceful co-existence' was popularly held, Indian leaders freely indulged in the pentologue of Panchsheel; after the battering from the Chinese, they were suddenly found in favour of a dialogue with Pakistan; now they are content with a monologue because, as President Ayub said, their thesis 'let goodwill grow' means 'let's have it our way'. They are not ready to be drawn into any discussion on Kashmir; they may be prepared for a concord if Pakistan writes off the word 'Kashmir' from her political lexicon. What infuriates them is that Pakistan not only advocates the Kashmir cause but claims the support of the people. The Indians assert that the people of Kashmir have

'repelled the Pakistani aggression twice'. It is easier to catch a liar than a cripple. The majority of these people are Muslims: can they explain why lakhs of them have taken refuge in Pakistan after the Maharaja developed colic trouble and announced accession to India? If these people had any democratic faith in the Indian regime, why did they totally boycott the recent by-elections to the State Assembly? If the Muslims are trusted citizens, why non-Muslims dominate all the centrally-controlled departments in Kashmir? And, finally, if they are so sure of their support, why do they not elicit the verdict of the people and end the problem once and for all? They are deceiving themselves when they brag that the people of Kashmir, though predominantly Muslim, do not wish to join Pakistan and instead 'they support the ideals of Mahatma Gandhi'. But it has to be proved and can only be proved by plebiscite. A Nagpur Hindu has embarrassingly summed up the Kashmir issue for Indian leaders: "It is obvious that the Kashmiris will vote either for an integration of Kashmir with India or against such integration if a plebiscite is held. If the Indian Government is sure that Kashmiris want to integrate their State with India, why doesn't it agree to a plebiscite? On the other hand, if the Indian Government is sure that the Kashmiris are against such integration, why are we forcing our will on them? In any case, a plebiscite is called for, the more so because the Security Council has voted with an overwhelming majority for it."

Truth may be eclipsed but it cannot perish; the fact is that India is profoundly diffident about the election victory; they are so mortally afraid of the vote



that Nehru, in November 1954, said in the course of a letter to the Pakistan Prime Minister, "one cannot go by the results of plebiscite completely because *some absurd results might follow*." India's patent excuse was that plebiscite in Kashmir was not possible until 'normal life is restored'. And, when, 'complete peace comes to prevail in the valley', they would perhaps say that there is no need for a plebiscite. Thus, the threat of peace in Kashmir is as grave as a state of lawlessness! Ridiculously enough, even India may be as scared of 'provoking peace' as she has always been fearful of another uprising in the State. If it is all quiet on the Kashmir front, she is bound by international commitments to hold a plebiscite; if there is no end to disorder and disturbances in the State, she incurs the risk of losing her face as the demand for plebiscite gains further momentum. Thus, India has to be as much disinterested in an 'all-out peace' as she is apprehensive of an 'all-out war'. But the fact is that there can be no peace in the State; new challenges are already looming over the horizon of Kashmir. For India, things are again getting out of hand; the crack of doom sounds audibly near; the people of Kashmir are no longer afraid of 'going over the brink.' They have been living all these years in a state of trauma but they have proved that they have never been committed to the status quo in Kashmir. In the opinion of a foreign observer, "the issue is on the verge of being stirred up once again not by the Indians, not by Pakistanis but by the Kashmiris themselves".

At a representative convention of Kashmiris, Sheikh Abdullah proclaimed, in a hard-hitting speech,

that "freedom will not fall from the skies. It will come when hundreds of young men get hanged on the scaffold". They openly advocate a people's war and a revolutionary movement on the pattern of Al-Fateh, the Algerians and Vietnamese. They have declared their right to start an armed revolt and prepare for guerilla warfare not only to crush the occupation forces but 'to destroy the economic structure of India.' The freedom struggle of Kashmir has entered a new and decisive phase; the convention has given Indian leaders cold feet; they know that another cycle of violence can touch off the direst trouble but they have deliberately pulled wool over their own eyes after throwing dust in them. They have cut off all communication lines; the idea is to isolate Abdullah; this strategy of silence has even been adopted by leading organs of Indian public opinion. For the time being they can perhaps ignore him but they cannot ignore all that Abdullah means and represents to his people. They cannot run away from the real issue, if only they could see the imminence of catastrophe.

Will they ever realize that Kashmir is one of those human and international problems that won't easily go away. Eighteen years ago, *Christian Science Monitor* warned: 'The storm clouds which might spell the outbreak of World War III are gathering over the beautiful Vale of Kashmir, famed in song and story.' *The Observer* of London has signalled that 'the situation in the State of Jammu and Kashmir is more dangerous and more important than the situation in Vietnam.' *The New York Herald Tribune* has pinpointed "the grave danger of maintaining a time bomb in the foothills of



Himalayas, a time bomb that could blow up all of Asia and shake the world." An old Indian political worker has characterised Kashmir as a "garland of razors round India's neck which cuts and bleeds". But they still think that there is nothing wrong with Kashmir which is safe in India's hands. Perhaps; but it is no more safe than the kid given by its mother to a jackal for safe-keeping. India has exposed itself before the world as a house of hate, hysteria and hypocrisy.

How long can India conceal the dangerous dimensions of the Kashmir dispute? The whole world has sifted categories of right and wrong in Kashmir but India continues to stick to the State's 'legal status' and assert that 'sovereignty is indivisible'. It is a typical political dodge to say one thing to foreigners and another to your own countrymen. Nehru once admitted that India was entrapped after referring the Kashmir dispute to the United Nations and 'it was not possible to say when we shall be free from this entanglement'. If Kashmir is a snare for India, they shall only be free when they realise the futility of the use of force. Kalhana, a twelfth century Hindu Kashmiri writer, had an intuitive conviction that "this country may be conquered by the force of spiritual merits but not by forces of soldiers." In Burke's memorable words: "People are not governed who are perpetually to be put down". Today, India is holding the Kashmiri Muslims by the throat; the whole mechanism of their government is geared to the fulfilment of purposes which are fatal to the wishes and welfare of the people. India's pathetic citadel of power is built on the persecution of the

majority population in Kashmir. There is not a single thinking Muslim adult in Kashmir 'who has not thought that he might get shot'. Perhaps the law of the jungle cannot cover the barbaric behaviour of men who profess to represent an ancient civilization. The enormity of India's crime in Kashmir has few parallels in contemporary history. What is most disturbing is that they always offer a new grimmick and never pause to assess the consequences of their involvement and brutal tyrannies in Kashmir.

Mrs. Pandit, Nehru's sister, has urged that "there must be vision—a third eye—behind a policy." The problem of Kashmir should not be beyond their vision if only they could free their minds from obfuscation and show the requisite imaginative insight and political sagacity. It will be the supreme moment of truth for India when it dawns upon her leaders that holding Kashmir by force is immeasurably more difficult than accepting and implementing UN resolutions. Every day, Kashmir is becoming an ungovernable land for India. One day, the convergence of problems, created by her colonial rule, will pose a challenge such as she has never faced or imagined in the past. Even if they are never bitten by the worm of conscience, one day, they will be shoved up against impending realities and realise the deadly sin of keeping a people in slavery. Time does not take sides; one day, India will be totally drained by the evil of ruling a people who do not want to be ruled by it.

—o— END :—o—

---

## APPENDICES

---

## APPENDIX I

*The reign of terror in Kashmir began as long ago as 1846, when the British sold the State to an upstart-tyrant. The Dogras continued to be despotic masters of the State till 1947; their monstrous acts, spread over a century of misrule, have been partially unmasked in chapter I of the book. This appendix is largely confined to atrocities committed during 1947 and subsequent years. The great Jammu massacre, immediately after partition, was one of the bloodiest in recent history. The killing and intimidation of Muslims continued intermittently until 1965 when, in the wake of the freedom-fighters, the Indian army, police and militant Hindu groups resorted to wholesale slaughter of the majority population.*

*Statements of some of the actual victims or eye-witnesses are documented here. Except for punctuation, here and there, these stories (released for the first time) have not been edited: a victim's version, in his own words, deserves to be reproduced as it is recorded. This is by no means a comprehensive coverage of their crime-sheet and much have been left out as it would have been far too unpleasant for a great many readers. The object is only to prove the case for genocide in Kashmir and not to present gruesome details or multiply tragic tales. There is also enough photographic record and evidence to prove that they did not spare instruments of torture and violence. The author has seen hundreds of these photographs but they are a little too ghastly for the general public: only a few were considered 'fit to print' in this part of the book.*

## CATALOGUE OF CRIMES

In October and November 1947, while the liberation movement was gaining ground in Poonch area and Muzaffarabad district, the RSS, the Dogras, the Sikhs and the Indian Army were out in force, massacring the Muslims in Jammu. The Muslims in Jammu had become alarmed at the fury with which rioting had engulfed the whole of East Punjab. They felt extremely nervous as September 1947 drew to an end. About 1,200 Muslims crossed the border into Pakistan as refugees. From about 20 October, Muslims in large numbers started pouring into Sialkot district in a miserable condition and they all had the same story to tell. The local non-Muslim population had been given arms and, with the assistance of RSS, Sikhs and other hostile elements, they had attacked village after village and had, on occasions, the active support of the State police and the Dogra army. As the Muslims departed, their houses were burnt and looted and unarmed helpless caravans were attacked on their way to the Pakistan border. Abduction of young girls, arson and loot, was a common feature of these raids and the depredations had the same pattern all over the Jammu province. Just before the large-scale massacres in the province got under way, the Maharaja himself toured the villages with truck-loads of arms and ammunition following him, and personally held consultations with the local officials, distributed arms and in some cases fired the first shot. He was seen on this mission in Akhnur, Bhimbar and Jammu Tehsils and later in Samba and Kathua Tehsils.

The attacks on the villages began about the middle of October. In the Reasi district, the rural population fled terror-stricken to the town of Reasi where, on November 4, a gun was installed by the State troops opposite Kashmiri Mohalla. Sikh soldiers took up positions on top of Prem Nath Autar Nath's house and machinegun

artillery fire commenced in the afternoon. Two prominent Muslims who had gone to see Thakur Gowardhan Singh, the Collector, were shot dead by him in the court. Notorious criminals were released from jail to participate in the attacks. Heavy casualties were inflicted during the general massacre that ensued and only young women were spared. Those girls who could not walk were thrown into the river Chenab and the rest were taken to Bhaberwali Rakh. At least 4,000 Muslims were killed in Reasi town alone. The number of dead in the surrounding villages is not known.

Kathua was visited by the Maharaja on 20 October, along with Mehr Chand Mahajan, the Prime Minister. Interviews were given to Hindus and were refused to Muslims who were looking for protection. After his tour, anti-Muslim feelings rose to a high pitch, particularly in Hirangar and Kathua tehsils. Attacks on an extensive scale were made on Muslim villages by armed mobs assisted by Dogra troops. At first the Muslims were refused permission to evacuate. On 22 October 6,000 of them assembled at village Moola Talab; Rs. 7,000 were taken from them as cost of safe escort to Pakistan. The convoy was attacked twice on the way. There were very few survivors. In Mirpur district, the Maharaja paid a visit on 20 October. He was accompanied by Dogra troops. The Maharaja ordered fire, whereupon armed mobs indulged in ruthless slaughter. Dogra troops and other lawless elements spread out into the district, specially in Tehsil Bhimbar, Manawar, Mirpur and Kotli, and massacred the Muslim population.

Terror-stricken people in thousands left their villages helter-skelter and collected for safety at central points (misnamed 'camps' for there were no arrangements for food or water) or formed convoys and fled towards Pakistan. This, however, did not save their lives. A convoy of 20,000 from Kathua was attacked by Dogra troops, RSS gangs, INA personnel and armed civilian mobs before the very eyes of the Maharaja on 20 October. Thousands were put to the sword and killed by rifle fire. Refugees who had assembled at Naryana near Dev Batala were attacked by armed hordes and when a Muslim approached the Maharaja, he fell a victim to the royal bullet. About 12,000 refugees collected at the Jammu aerodrome early in

November were machine-gunned. Four thousand died and another 2,000 were made the target of four hand-grenades which were thrown at them when they were asleep. Refugee camps at Dagiana and Balbiana were attacked, with the help of guards. On 17 October, the Muslim population of Ranbir Singh Pura tehsil—men, women and children—ran for safety to the Government Electric Power House at Miran Sahib. "At the camp", says a refugee, "we were given no water, no rations, nor were we allowed to go anywhere. The camp was surrounded on all sides by the military who used to come into the camp at night and forcibly take away young women for adultery, which they committed behind nearby trees and bushes." Mehr Chand Mahajan, the Dewan of the State, arrived on the scene accompanied by Bharat Bhushan, the local Tahsildar and an active member of the RSS. The Dewan assured the people, numbering over 25,000, of their safety but no sooner had he left them than armed mobs and Dogra troops fell on them. Only about 10,000 escaped. On 19 October, a convoy of 30,000 Muslims who were marching on foot were halted near the Jammu-Tawi Station and were machine-gunned by Dogra troops. There are details in the accounts maintained by some refugees that sometimes bring out the horror and calculated brutality of the attacks quite unintentionally: "Indian military jeeps surrounded us and lit up our convoy from all sides with the headlights of their cars. Two hundred girls were abducted . . . ."

### SHOCKING AND SHAMEFUL

What happened in this town, the Maharaja's capital, begs description and no pen can improve on the story as related by the eye-witnesses themselves. No introductory remarks are necessary; here is the first account: "On 15 October 1947, I was coming to Sialkot but was detained at Suchetgarh by the officials of the Customs Department and the State Military. They said that I could not cross the border without the permission of the Governor. I had no alternative but to return home. I was actually pushed back by the soldiers and the Custom Department's peons. On 17 October, in the whole countryside around the Jammu city, the RSS parties and the military started systematic looting, burning, kidnapping and slaughtering campaign. The whole thing started so suddenly

and simultaneously in every part of the countryside that one could not help thinking that everything had been carefully worked out before making a start. Very few people could escape to Jammu city from the countryside. They were killed either in their villages or on their way to Jammu city. Young women were kidnapped but the older ones were done away with. Most of the refugees were wounded, absolutely penniless and in rags. The city Muslims rendered all help they could, but they too had become panic-stricken as the murderers closed in on them after clearing the countryside. The next step of the marauders was to exterminate about twentyfive thousand 'beldars' (road builders and labourers, etc.) near the Railway Station, Jammu city, by rifle and machinegun fire. The next victims for slaughter were the labourers in Miran Sahib Rosin and turpentine factory about seven miles from Jammu. The loss of Muslim life there was no less than nearly nine thousand persons. A lull followed but for only two days and we began to think that the marauders had called a halt to their murdering and plundering exploits. Two days later, Muslim houses situated in predominantly Hindu mohallas of Jammu city came in for attack. Only a few could reach safely. The rest were killed. Then they turned their attention to Jogi Darwaza, Mohalla Darugaran and Jalaka Mohalla. At first the State military started firing on the houses, shattering windows and doors and then forced entry in the houses and began robbing the inmates and dragging away the girls. The slightest resistance or reluctance to obey their orders was punished by a bullet or a bayonet without any hesitation. The frightened lot of Muslims began to stampede out of their homes and flee to Mohalla Dalpatian, Pir Mitha and Bazar Qasaban. In short, all the surviving Muslims gathered in these three mohallas. This happened before the Id-ul-zaha festival which fell on 25 October.

"On the night preceding the Id, these three localities were subjected to an attack. These mohallas are surrounded by Hindu population who possess the tallest houses in the town. All these houses were veritable fortresses fully equipped with long range rifles, modern automatic weapons, hand-grenades and incendiaries. The low lying Muslim houses in the centre provided easy enough targets and

and all the Muslim residents were encircled by the enemy without any way of escape. The day of Id, and the following night and day, resounded with terrible firing and there was not a minute's respite. On Tuesday, the day following the Id, a car fitted with a loudspeaker broadcast that peace had been restored in the city, that the Muslims should return to their homes and that no disturbance was likely to occur henceforth. The firing ceased except for an occasional shot, but the terrified survivors did not return to their homes. The same night Mohalla Mastgarh, another Muslim Mohalla, was set on fire. The Muslims who had gone to extinguish the fire, were shot at. On the day of Id, we had been told by a Gurkha Jamadar whom I can identify at sight, that if we flew the State flags from our house-tops we would be safe. Everybody did so, but to our grief we came to know later that this was a ruse to single out Muslim houses. No Hindu house had any flag on it. After the evening of the 26th, a comparative calm followed. A Muslim deputation waited on the Prime Minister, Mr. Mahajan, and requested him to arrange for the safe evacuation of the surviving Muslims to the Pakistan territory. He gave the deputation to understand that he was prepared to ask the military for the evacuation of Muslims but could not accept the responsibility for their safety. I was also a member of the deputation which included Captain Mian Nasir-ud-Din (now under arrest), a retired official and four others whose names I don't remember. We returned to our homes undecided. Some of the leading Muslims including the said Captain conveyed the message that the State Government were, doubtful of our loyalty and feared a recrudescence of trouble at our hands. Therefore, in order to be sure of the loyalty and goodwill the authorities wanted us to deposit the weapons which in fact had long ago been confiscated. The Muslims could not even go about with hockey sticks. The students going for play were made to hand over their sticks on pain of arrest while the Hindus could go about carrying swords and even guns. Under these circumstances, we could not have dared to keep any weapons and we, therefore, invited the authorities to search our houses.

"About four days after Id, Captain Nasir-ud-Din was sent for at the Prime Minister's residence, where he was told to convey

to the Muslims that they should be ready with one bedding and trunk each to depart at short notice. The Muslims had put a request through the Captain for an interview with Sheikh Abdullah or with His Highness or any responsible person of the Pakistan Government, but it was not acceded to. On the other hand, a threat was given that non-compliance of the eviction order would absolve the State of any responsibility for our safety. The Captain conveyed this to us later in the night and the next morning, at about 8.00 a.m., a lorry with a loudspeaker broadcast the order to Muslims to gather at the Police Lines at 9 a.m. It was Wednesday the 5th of November. Accordingly, we Muslims, began to collect at the Police Lines where everybody's person and luggage were searched. Even some of the women were not spared. Every valuable article, like ornaments, cash, watches, pens, bicycles and radio sets, was taken into possession. This search was conducted jointly by the military and the police. Next we were ordered to shift to the ground where about 50 lorries were parked. About 35 lorries were loaded beyond capacity and started at about 3 p.m. I do not know where these lorries were driven to, because I did not board any and stayed back. About 10,000 people remained behind in that ground and had to wait without food and water for the next convoy. On Thursday, the fate of last day's convoy being unknown, we were reluctant to board the next convoy of 25 vehicles. I did not board any vehicle in this convoy. These lorries left by about 11 a.m. (Thursday) and their destination too was not known. On the night between Thursday and Friday while I was asleep in the same ground I was awakened by the impact of a man on my body. I jumped up and, to my surprise, saw a stark naked person. He asked about my uncle, Sh. Mohammad Amin, a worker of the Muslim Conference, and informed us that the lorries which had left on Thursday were taken towards the Kathua side and halted on the Ranber canal bridge about two miles from Jammu Cantonment. The refugees therein were being slaughtered and women dragged away. On Friday morning some more lorries came and people got into them but a leading Muslim citizen named Ghulam Pehalwan asked everybody to get down. A deputation headed by Captain Nasir-ud-Din waited on Kanwar Sir Dalip Singh, a representative of the Indian Union. He told the deputation that the

Muslims would have to vacate the State sooner or later. As a result of deputation's protest, the military of the Indian Union was commissioned for the escort of vehicles. No convoy left Jammu on Friday. On Saturday at about 4 p.m. a convoy of six lorries left Jammu and returned at about 7 p.m. On Sunday, the 7th of November, I too left with a convoy of 11 lorries at about 8 a.m."

## SAVAGE TYRANNIES

The second eye-witness reported :

"Owing to frequent attacks by Sangh people on our houses in Mohalla Mastgarh I, along with my family members, had shifted to the house of Shaikh Jan Mohammad, in Mohalla Jiwan Shah. Many Muslim families from mixed mohallas or from isolated places had done the same. Muslims had concentrated in the adjoining Muslim mohallas—Talab Khatikan, Jewan Shah and Bazar Qasaban. These mohallas were gradually but completely encircled by military posts and morchas of the RSS. The RSS had in those days been fully armed and reinforced by members from outside the State. Many unfamiliar faces, especially Sikhs of tall stature and dark complexion, were seen collaborating with them. They were said to be from Eastern Punjab and Sikh States. The circle of these morchas was steadily being narrowed every day. It had now transformed our mohallas practically into a camp. On the west we could not go beyond Urdu bazar and on the eastern and southern sides our limits of excursions were Residency and Wazarat roads. Conditions prevailing in this so-called 'camp' were deplorable. Electric and water supply were both most irregular and insufficient and so were the rations. There were no sanitary arrangements. Sweepers and sanitary staff were not allowed by the military to enter the area. We were cleaning latrines and drains ourselves. There were about 250 wounded persons mostly from villages. These wounded villagers who had succeeded in reaching the city related heart-rending accounts of the general and wholesale massacre of the Muslim population of their villages—how their kith and kin had been murdered brutally, their houses set on fire and at places whole families annihilated. I along with Dr. Rehmat Ullah



and a few compounders used to dress these unfortunate persons, at the risk of our own lives because shooting and sniping was at times very violent. We possessed very little dressing material but we were doing our best with certain improvised articles at our disposal. The firing from morchas increased day by day. We were completely cut off from Muslims in Mohalla Ustad and Mohalla Jowlakha. At times the firing became so intense that it was impossible to walk about in the lanes or to go up on the roofs of our houses. Many persons were wounded or succumbed to the bullets coming in from all directions. We received news of the slaughter of about 300 persons (mostly Muslim refugees from villages), who had taken refuge in Mohalla Darugaran. Next day we learnt of the massacre of more than 150 persons in the house of Babu Abdul Hamid, an overseer. Only one person named Ibrahim Gujjar was able to contact us in a severely-wounded condition out of the unfortunate 150 in the house. He had three sword cuts on his neck and two on his back. He managed to escape when dead bodies from the house were being removed in military trucks. A few days later, the circle was further tightened and the morchas were now nearer. About 40 persons were slaughtered in Jewan Shah Tomb. The Muslims had now been practically cornered in a few houses with the house of Sh. Jan Mohammad at the centre. There was great panic. Innumerable persons at this camp had already been butchered. The end of all the besieged looked near. Just at this time an order by the District Magistrate was announced according to which all firing was to cease. Muslims were accused of possessing a large quantity of arms and ammunition. They were directed to deposit all arms and ammunition with the Government before 10 o'clock next day. In the announcement it was further promised that those who wanted to leave the State would be given safe passage.

"A few days later, on 25 November 1947, Wednesday, when the general atmosphere appeared somewhat calm, we were asked to vacate our houses and report to the Police Lines before 9 a.m. This was announced from the loudspeakers of a police van. Accordingly, we reached the place with whatever little belongings we could carry, leaving everything else in our houses. In the grounds adjoining the

Police Lines we lay with our kith and kin. Here a thorough search was conducted by the police and the military. Even a pair of small scissors which I had in my hand-case was confiscated. At about 12, lorries began to reach the camp and included some military trucks. In all 39 lorries, each carrying about 70/80 persons, left the camp at about 2 p.m. Each lorry had a military man as escort. The convoy carried away about 3,000 persons. Two of my younger brothers and my elder son with four suitcases and two beddings succeeded in climbing on the roofs of the trucks. Suchetgarh is about 18 miles from Jammu; we expected the trucks to be back by 4 or at the most by 5 p.m., but none came back that day. We made enquiries from the police, the military and other persons but were given vague and various explanations. Doubt lurked in our minds. We could not make contact with persons outside the camp. The Indian Military were seen all around us. In the camp, we had nothing to eat. There was no water supply. We passed the night without food and water. Next day, on 6 November, Thursday, at about 8 a.m., trucks appeared but, as we came to know afterwards, these were not the same as had gone with the convoy the day before. I, along with my family members, 22 in all, succeeded in getting into three different trucks. The trucks were 26 in all. This day the lorries carried no separate escort but there was a jeep carrying Dogra military men in the rear and a lorry full of Indian Military men wearing red caps, and with the mark 'Rajput' on their shoulders. When the convoy left the city we noticed people armed with swords, axes and spears on both sides of the road. From Tawi bridge many gangs of these armed persons could be seen in the sandy bed on both sides of the river. These gangs were heading in a southerly direction. When we reached Satwari Cantonment, instead of driving straight towards Suchetgarh, our lorries were turned towards the left on a kacha road along the canal bank, in the direction of Bishua. The armed gangs, now many more in number, could be seen all around us. After going for some distance on this road, the lorries were halted. The military men in the jeep went ahead and came back after sometime. We were much perturbed to find that the direct route to our destination had been abandoned. We made enquiries from the military men and were told that the road

near Biloul Nallah was not in a fit condition and that we would be taken to Miran Sahab through Pandalian. According to another military man there was danger of an attack near Miran Sahab: so we were being taken by a safer route. We tried to come out of the lorries but the military men objected to it and threatened to fire if we attempted to come down from the lorries. When the convoy was thus halted we saw two lorries full of RSS people going on the Samba road on our left. As we came to know afterwards, the convoy was halted because the number of attackers was not sufficient to attack the convoy and the Sangh people were now being sent in lorries to the places fixed for onslaught. After sometime, the convoy started. As we proceeded on the road, the number of gangs increased. Many were hiding behind bushes and long grass and cactus plants. After going up for a mile or so all the 26 trucks were halted on either side of a bridge on the left side of which was the canal and on the right a steep slope. There was a military truck in front of the convoy and a jeep carrying Dogra military men at the tail end. Soon after this, the military men came out of their vehicles and took up positions. One Indian military man came up to the bridge and began to fire with a bren-gun. It appeared to me that it was a signal to the gangs to start the attack, because soon after the firing, they started on the lorries and nobody out of the attackers was seen following. The attack started from the rear and soon spread all over the convoy. Attackers climbed up the lorries and surrounded them completely. Swords, axes and spears were freely used. Men, women, and children were hacked to pieces. Shrieks of young women and girls who were being forcibly dragged by the gangsters could be heard from almost all the lorries. The attackers were striking most violently and mercilessly. Small children were lifted by one arm and cut into pieces. Wounded and dead children were being thrown into the canal. Some with spears were attacking the lorries from the sides through windows and doors. The lorry which I was occupying was in this row. The attack started from the rear and Muslims who tried to flee were shot at by the military. Soon our own lorry was surrounded on all sides by the attackers—mostly Sikhs—probably not belonging to the State. My two sisters were snatched away from us. My aunts who tried to hold them back were given spear thrusts

and done to death. My two uncles and my daughter aged about 8 years were killed on the spot. One of my sisters who was pregnant received a sword cut on her abdomen and lay by the side of the lorry. I received five or six spear thrusts on my left shoulder and back. While I was still in the lorry and was trying to come out and projected my head out of the back door of the lorry I received an axe cut on my head. This made me unconscious for sometime. I fell with my face downward just behind the lorry. After sometime, I saw the road and the canal bank full of dead and wounded men, women and children, not less than one thousand in number. Shrieks of young women could still be heard far and near. My wife and young son and the wife of my elder brother were also wounded but were alive. Twelve members of my family in that lorry were seen lying dead by our sides among many other dead bodies. The injury on my head which had made me unconscious saved my life. I was taken to be dead. During this unconscious state I was searched by the gangs. My purse and everything in my pockets, even my stethoscope, was removed. Even after gaining consciousness, I lay in the same position. I saw Sikhs, Dogras as well as Indian military men, looting the lorries and firing at the Muslims who tried to hide themselves in the canal or in the grass and bushes or tried to run away from the place. This continued for a pretty long time. In the evening, when the whole business was practically over, the military men became apparently sympathetic and asked the people who were wounded or hiding near about to get into the lorries. I, along with six out of the total of 22 members of our family, managed to climb the lorries—one of my uncles and one sister (pregnant) who were wounded and were still alive but could not get into the lorries, had to be abandoned on the road to die. After the wounded and the remaining persons had entered the lorries, we were carried to the Cantonment and Civil Hospitals (twice to each place) but, excepting myself and the half-alive members of my family who were taken to the hospital by the M.S., all others were removed (I afterwards learnt) to the Dagiana camp where, for days, they were neither fed nor dressed. Many, especially children, succumbed to the injuries. I learnt that except those in the camps, every one knew that the convoys were to be attacked and not a single soul was to

be spared . . and that the RSS people, imported Sikhs and military men in plain clothes were being sent to the places, selected for attacks since 5 a.m., in jeeps and military trucks. The gangs who attacked the convoy on 6 November (Thursday) were composed of RSS men, Achuts and Sikhs who came from East Punjab and did not apparently belong to the State. They were armed with spears, swords, axes and a few with guns."

The convoys were attacked on 5 and 6 November. Sardar Vallabhai Patel, Deputy Prime Minister and Sardar Baldev Singh, Defence Minister of India, visited Jammu on the 4th, the date on which the offer of safe escort to Pakistan was announced to the beleaguered Muslims of Jammu through loudspeakers. At that time no "desperadoes from the tribal territory" had appeared on the horizon of the Province of Jammu and the Indian Army had been in Kashmir for a week.

G. K. Reddy Editor "Kashmir Times" said about his stay in Jammu :

"The mad orgy of Dogra violence against unarmed Muslims should put any self-respecting human being to shame. I saw armed bands, ruffians and soldiers shooting down and hacking to pieces helpless Muslim refugees heading towards Pakistan.

My pain and agony was heightened by what I saw at the village of Rajpura where the State officials and military officers were directing a huge armed mob against a Muslim refugees convoy and got it routed. State officials freely distributed arms and ammunitions among the Dogras.

From the hotel room where I was detained in Jammu, I counted as many as 24 villages burning one night and all through the night rattling fire of automatic weapons could be heard from the surrounding refugee camps."

Colonel J.M.B.C. Plowden, Registrar, British Red Cross Society, had examined atrocity victims before they were admitted to Hospital and, regarding one of them, he reported : "Briefly, the victim stated that, having been captured by Gurkha troops, he was

tied up in a tree all night. In the morning he was made to dig a trench until about mid-day. He was given no food or drink. He was then taken before a Sikh Lieut.-Colonel who questioned him and then ordered a party of about 20 of his Gurkhas to take him to "Pakistan Nullah," or the place of execution.

"Having been taken there he was beaten and slashed, with kukris. He was then thrown in a ditch and covered with stones. Later in the night he recovered consciousness and managed to make his way back to his village. A companion with him did not survive this treatment, and the man said he saw other corpses of killed persons in the same ditch. I inspected the man's scars. He had seven in all, and they appeared definitely to have been caused by kukri wounds. The incident, he said, took place about two miles west of Rajauri town. He gave the date, but I cannot now recollect it."

## UNBEARABLE TORTURES

A very highly-placed neutral observer said : The most dreadful evidence I witnessed with my own eyes when I was hurriedly bundled into a jeep and taken to the Kathua border adjoining Pakistan territory.

In a sparsely harvested wheat field I saw the mangled remnants of human flesh lying splattered across a large area. The bodies had been crushed under tank caterpillars, the marks of which were visibly leading away from Pakistan territory.

In the Civil Hospital at Gujrat I saw an atrocity victim who had miraculously escaped from Rajouri and he recounted his awful story. His neck and body had been slashed to ribbons and two big wounds showed on his wrist where he had been bound tightly before being submitted to torture—as the medical officer confirmed—by kukris and bayonets.

## ANOTHER FACTUAL REPORT

And here is a factual report jointly submitted by two foreigners who visited the subcontinent and were commissioned for this purpose by the Governments of India and Pakistan :

"On the morning of November 5, it was announced by beat of drum in Jammu city, in the name of His Highness the Maharaja, that all Muslims must immediately leave the State, and that, in fact, Pakistan had asked for them. They were instructed to assemble at the parade ground in Jammu. Conducted from there to the Police Lines, they were searched, deprived of most of their belongings and loaded on motor lorry convoys. They were told that they would be sent to Suchetgarh but instead the convoys took the Kathua Road and halted at Mawa, where the passengers were told to get down.

"At Mawa, the lorry drivers, who were Sikhs and armed to the teeth, removed all the young women from the convoys and began to attack the remainder. The Kashmir State troops looked on indifferently while the mobs of Sikhs and Hindus were killing the Muslims.

"Out of the four thousand Muslims, who had left Jammu, only nine hundred managed to reach Sialkot, in Pakistan.

"A convoy of seventy trucks, containing most of the respectable Muslim families of Jammu city, left for Suchetgarh on November 6. A few miles out of the city, the trucks were halted and were attacked by armed jathas of Sikhs and State troops and volunteers of the Rashtrya Swayam Sewak Sangh.

"During the beginning of October, 1947, about fourteen thousand Muslims living in Sambha were besieged by armed Hindus and Sikhs who cut off the rations and water-supply of the villages. On October 23, Sambha village was visited by His Highness the Maharaja himself, and almost immediately after his visit, all the Muslim women in the village were taken away by State troops, and the men were slaughtered with the exception of fifteen survivors, who escaped to Sialkot. About eight thousand Muslims assembled at the Bulla Tank near Kathua on October 20, after their request for protection had been ignored by the sub-divisional magistrate of Kathua. After marching three miles towards the Pakistan border, they were encircled by Dogra troops and armed Sikh civilians, and all of them were slaughtered with the exception of forty persons, who managed to escape to Sialkot.

"On the instructions of the State Government, about twentyfive thousand Muslims from Miran Sahib area collected at Maogaon to be evacuated to Pakistan. But as they were doing so, their women and all their personal belongings were taken away from them by Dogra troops, and the rest made to stand in a line, whereupon they were riddled with machine-gun bullets. Only one hundred of them escaped, hiding in maize fields."

### 1965 : A POIGNANT SUMMER

The Indo-Pakistan war which broke out on September 6 came to an end after seventeen days. Immediately afterwards India started evicting Muslim population from across the cease-fire line in Kashmir. Thousands of Kashmiri Muslims were uprooted from their homes and pushed into Azad Kashmir. The refugees had absolutely no household belongings with them. Many of them were half-naked or in rags and quite a number of these homeless people were wounded, crippled and carried on their bodies marks of torture.

In addition to their unbearable misery they also brought with them hair-raising tales of systematic massacres, of villages set ablaze, of human beings burnt alive, of tortures, rape and abduction. These atrocities were committed by the Indian army, Indian police forces and militias and volunteers of Jan Sangh, a militant Hindu organization. Shocking incidents took place almost everywhere in Indian occupied Kashmir but Batmalu in Srinagar, Rajouri, Mendhar and the entire belt adjoining the cease-fire line suffered the most. The main purpose of this wholesale massacre and eviction of Muslims was to intimidate the freedom fighters and to make room for Hindu settlers.

Approximately, 90,000 Muslims crossed the cease-fire line into Pakistan. Is it estimated that nearly 10,500 persons, including men, women and children, were killed in about ninety villages in 1965 alone. Women were brutally raped. The number of young girls abducted by Indian army is about 4,687. Their fate is not known.

Atrocities of exactly the same character but of greater magnitude had been perpetrated on Muslims in 1947 and intermittently during the ensuing years. The very presence of 6,00,000 Kashmiri Muslim refugees in banishment both in Pakistan and Azad Kashmir

is a living and irrefutable evidence of brutal Indian aggression. All these refugees have been parted from their kith and kin and deprived of their belongings. Most of them have lost their near and dear ones and have suffered physical and mental torture before they were pushed into Pakistan. This part of the appendix is largely confined to the atrocities committed by the Indian army and its collaborators on the Kashmiri Muslims before, during and after Indo-Pakistani conflict in 1965. It is based on signed and tape-recorded statements of the refugees.

*Statement of Haji Fazal Hussain, son of Ch. Faiz  
Mohammad, resident of Prodi Gojran, District  
Poonch; age 36 years*

I was a worker of Jammu and Kashmir Plebiscite Front and remained, as such, actively associated with the freedom movement. In this connection, I have had opportunities of meeting Sher-i-Kashmir, Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, Maulana Masudi and Maulvi Farooq and took necessary instructions from them.

Ch. Fazal Hussain further deposed that after Indo-Pak cease-fire, which took place on 23-9-1965, the Indian tirade did not cease. On the contrary it was intensified. The cease-fire gave them a further opportunity to disengage troops from Pakistan and augment the existing force in Kashmir. Under the circumstances we were compelled to withdraw. He said, "on our withdrawal, the Indian authorities resorted to indiscriminate killing of civilian population on a large scale. A cash award of Rs. 15,000.00 was announced for arresting me. I was, therefore, compelled to flee alongwith some of the members of my family. I crossed over Nakyal via Kanga Gali and am now residing at Mirpur. Subsequent reports and fresh arrivals have confirmed about 41 persons of my family including my five brothers were ruthlessly killed; 48 members of my family including 3 male survivors who somehow managed to escape the murder reached Mirpur for refuge".

*Statement of Ch. Mohammad Maqbool Raza, Development  
Officer of Rajouri, son of Ch. Khan Mulikh,  
District Poonch; age 26 years*

Narrating his story he stated that he belonged to a respectable family. His grandfather, Ch. Diwan Ali, was one of the famous political leaders of Rajouri and Akhnor. During the War of Liberation 172 persons of his family had been slaughtered by the Jansanghis. The Provisional Government set up by the freedom fighters in 1947 could not but last for six months only for want of reinforcement in time. It was, therefore, recaptured by the Dogra Indian forces. He and his family migrated to Pakistan. He participated in the Kashmir Liberation Movement launched by the veteran Kashmiri Leader, Ch. Ghulam Abbas. Later on he crossed over to Rajouri and settled there. In 1962 he contested an Assembly seat there as an Independent candidate. Although he had full backing of his community, the official nominee of Bakhshi Ghulam Mohammad, the then Prime Minister of the India-held Kashmir, got his nomination papers rejected on the ground that he was a pro-Pakistani. He wanted to go in for an appeal against this but as soon as he reached Jammu, he was arrested and imprisoned in Hazuri Bagh Special Jail.

The people of his area protested against this illegal arrest and he was released on parole. He then took up service and was offered a post of Welfare Officer at Kathua. But very soon he realised that the local Jansanghis and followers of Guru Gowalkar were working against the Muslims. Since he was a muslim with pro-Pakistani leanings, the Jansanghis launched demonstrations against him which resulted in his transfer. He was then appointed Block Development Officer in the Community Development and Agriculture Department.

In the meantime, India took some reckless and unilateral decisions to abrogate section 370 of the Indian Constitution which gave Occupied Kashmir a special status. Indian laws were extended to Occupied Kashmir thus virtually merging it with India. These flagrant and provocative measures compelled Kashmiris to rise in open revolt

against India. A state-wide movement followed to which Rajouri Tehsil was no exception. In Rajouri, it was Haji Fazal Hussain of Parori Gujran who took the initiative and raised the banner of revolt. He called a secret meeting of prominent political workers and urged them to rise to the occasion in self-defence.

There was an enthusiastic popular response to this call. The people of Rajouri fought very bravely and offered not only the sacrifice of their property but also of their lives in order to free themselves from Indian shackles. Continuing his painful story he said that about 41 persons from the family of Haji Fazal Hussain were ruthlessly slain by the Indians. After cease-fire, the circumstances took a very serious turn. The Indians withdrew most of their forces from the sectors of Rajasthan, Sialkot and Lahore for deployment in Occupied Kashmir. The freedom fighters were small in number and were not in a position to face the additional might thrown in by the enemy. They had, therefore, no alternative but to withdraw. Thus, after recapturing the lost area, the Indians out of vengeance committed gruesome atrocities on the innocent Muslim civilians. They started burning the Muslims alive in their houses. The eyes of some of them were torn out in order to terrorise others into submission. Thousands of Muslims, he added, have been done to death in Rajouri, Budhal, Kandi, Parori Gujran, Trala Gujran, Dharahl, Thanna and Ram Garh. The streets of Ram Garh were littered with dead bodies. Many Muslims who had been arrested were detained in the Interrogation Centre of Rajouri where they were subjected to inhuman torture. The Indian soldiers and Jansanghis kidnapped hundreds of Muslim girls who have been taken to India. Almost every house was set on fire and all the property looted or destroyed.

He ultimately migrated to Azad Kashmir by crossing Kanga Gali on 27 September, 1965.

*Statement of Malik Abdul Rehman Akhtar, Pleader, son of  
Malik Saeedullah, resident of Dharahl Malikan,  
District Poonch, age 28 years*

He stated that he was in the final year of M.A.L.L.B. when he contested for a seat of India-held Kashmir State Assembly. Since during Bakhshi's regime, elections had never been impartial, he did not succeed. After clearing his final he resigned from the Socialist Party because basically he and his family members had pro-Pakistan feelings. He then started his practice at Jammu as a pleader. After one year of his practice at Jammu he shifted to Rajouri.

After the sacred hair was located and reinstalled in Hazratbal shrine, he met Maulana Masoodi who directed him to continue the activities of Action Committee in view of the fresh wave of repression having started against the Muslims living particularly near the cease-fire line.

He further disclosed that during the marriage ceremony in the respectable family of Munshi Abdul Karim, Chairman Panchayat Committee, Dari Lalot, where some women folk of the village had assembled, some Indian soldiers broke into the house on the pretext of their being Pakistani participants in the ceremony. But what they did is that they tied the men with ropes and searched the clothes of women folk present there and humiliated them.

On 9 August when state-wide movement started in Jammu and Kashmir, the local freedom fighters of his area also followed suit. In our very first encounter, the Indian army was driven away from Pari, Kandi and Budhal. Even in Rajouri the enemy troops were besieged by the freedom fighters. Having beaten them out, the Revolutionary Council established its own civil administration. After the cease-fire, India diverted her forces from the sectors of Lahore and Sialkot etc. for deployment in Kashmir. The freedom fighters had, therefore, to withdraw from the liberated areas.

After their retreat, the Indian army resorted to exterminating innocent Muslim population. Thousands of them, including men,

women and children, were mercilessly slain. In Dharhal Malikan alone, at least 700 Muslims were ruthlessly killed and girls kidnapped. Among those who were killed at Dharhal Malikan by the Indians were Maulana Mohammad Hassan, Zaildar Karamatullah and Malik Abdul Rashid. The last mentioned was a Social Education Officer of Mairinder and had joined the freedom fighters. Malik Abdul Rashid was also working as a Tehsildar under the Revolutionary Council. In addition to this, Sayed Haider Ali Shah, a famous poet, Sardar Ghulam Din who was one of the staunch workers of Revolutionary Committee were also subjected to mental and physical torture before they were killed.

Continuing he said that Sardar Qudratullah Malik, Ali Bhadore and Summao Khan, members of the Council were arrested and taken to concentration camps at Jammu. All the houses in Dharhal Malikan were looted and 11 Kumaon Regiment, 8 Militia and Central Reserve Police Battalions occupied these houses. Those who were leading the operation from the Indian side were Colonel P.P. Chohan, Lt.-Col. Kanwal Singh etc. After the occupation of this place by the Indians it appeared as if there had never been a single Muslim dweller in the area. It had been reduced into a big graveyard.

Similarly, he stated, that the villages of Kandi, Bhudhal, Somout, Pari, Parori Barought, Ram Garh and Dahonour were burnt to ashes by the Indian gangsters and thousands of Muslims were killed and many more rendered homeless. Continuing he said that, according to an estimate, at least 32,000 Muslims were slain in Rajouri sector and about 6000 arrested and taken to different concentration camps.

He further stated that he and his few companions in which Ch. Niamatullah, Sardar Faraqullah and Talib Hussain were also included took shelter for 20 days in the thick forests of Margabi at different places where from all of them, later on, crossed the cease-fire line via Nakyal sector and entered into Azad Kashmir.

*Statement of Malik Talib Hussain, son of Feroze Ali, resident of Dharhal Malikan, District Poonch; age 38 years*

He stated that he was a member of the Plebiscite Front and had worked in this capacity for several years. During the struggle in 1965 he and his colleagues organised volunteers to fight the Indian occupation force and the Jansanghis. The Revolutionary Council had appointed him Joint Secretary of the Revolutionary Committee of Dharhal Malikan. When the enemy attacked Palam, he and his colleagues damaged the link road between Rajouri and Dharhal to prevent the enemy advance. The Indian posts were attacked and army stores seized. However, the freedom fighters were not fully equipped, as the enemy succeeded in recapturing Dharhal Malikan which was one of the local strongholds of the Revolutionary Council.

During the operations Malik Karamatullah, Zaildar, who was a prominent leader and President of the Revolutionary Committee, and his colleagues namely, Maulvi Mohammad Hussain, Malik Abdul Rashid, Naib Tehsildar, and Ali Haider Shah were arrested and subjected to inhuman torture continuously for 8 days. Giving the details of this brutality, he said that they were made to eat red pepper and while streams of tears were gushing out of their eyes and nostrils, they protested against the cruelty but the Indians paid little heed to their protests and requests and severely flogged them until blood began to ooze out of their mouth and other limbs. They become unconscious and fell down on the ground in a very precarious condition. The following day, he continued, when they regained consciousness, they were ordered to surrender all the rifles and produce the so-called infiltrators before them. According to him, the Indian Colonel Kanwal Singh asked them to bring their women also with them but he and Zaildar Karamatullah refused to bow before their meanness. Thereupon both of them were beaten with rifle butts and killed. Their property was looted.

During the visit of the Deputy Minister Anand Saroop and the Cabinet Minister of Occupied Kashmir Mr. Tralochan Datt, the



people demanded that their martyrs should be handed over to them so that they could bury them properly but the request was turned down. Two women namely, Noor Begum and her mother-in-law were openly molested. Mohammad Aslam, the husband of Noor Begum, apprised the local Indian Commander of this highhandedness but he was mercilessly killed alongwith those women. What is more, an award of Rs. 10,000.00 was announced for his arrest. The total loss done to him, according to his statement, comes to Rs. 98,000.00. The deponent, Malik Talib Hussain, further stated that many Muslims of his village were arrested and taken to Rajouri where they were subjected to extreme torture. Under these circumstances he migrated to Azad Kashmir alongwith his 62 family members.

He further stated that in 1947 also the Muslims of Dharhal had raised the banner of revolution against the Dogra Government. The Indian authorities, therefore, looted the property of the Muslim population. The young Muslim girls were kidnapped while the remaining people took refuge in the forests.

*Statement of Mohammad Bashir Sartaj, son of Mohammad Abdullah, resident of Dharhal Malikan, District Poonch. age 24 years*

He stated that he passed his Matriculation Examination in 1956 and was working as a Copyist in the Judicia Department of India-held Kashmir. He had also worked as Nazir and Clerk in the criminal branch and had completed four years of his service. In the meantime, he passed his F. A. Examination privately but even after four years service, his appointment was not confirmed in contravention of the Kashmir Service Regulations. Since he was a Muslim, the Hindu authorities were always harsh to him. He was finally dismissed from service to make room for a Middle-pass Hindu youngman namely, Krishan Lal Datt of Samba, a nominee of Jansanghis. He therefore, became a clerk of a Muslim Pleader in Rajouri because all the doors of Government employment were closed on the Muslims. The differential treatment meted out to Muslims at the hands of Hindu officials was one of the causes of discontent.

The patience of Kashmiris, he stated, was overtaxed and when steps were taken by the Indian colonialists to merge Occupied Kashmir, the Muslims sprang up for direct action against them and fought very bravely in many sectors. They defeated the Indian forces in a number of sectors seizing several Indian important posts in the area.

After the cease-fire India brought more troops into action. The Muslim villages were pillaged and innocent Muslim citizens killed indiscriminately. Thousands of Muslims fell victim to the genocidal operation. An Interrogation Centre was set up at Rajouri for the prisoners under the supervision of Punjab Police.

In view of the above circumstances, he alongwith his mother, brother and a few other relatives crossed the Pir Fazil Picket on 7 November 1965. While the caravan was on its way, his brother died as he was hit by an Indian bomb.

*Statement of Wali Dad, son of Choudhry Farman Ali, resident of Dhangri, District Poonch; age 32 years*

He stated that he was dubbed as a Pakistani agent. Hindu elements of village Dhangri used to send concocted reports to the Indian army officers accusing his uncle namely, Choudhry Sher Mohammad, of having liaison with the Pakistani forces command. Consequently the Indian army sent 500 soldiers to besiege the village. A machine-gun was installed nearby. The house of Mr. Wali Dad was situated at two furlongs from the forest. All of a sudden the Indian forces opened fire and started shelling the forest. Quite a number of muslims were hauled up and the women folk stripped of their ornaments. Commander of the Indian force openly charged them of indulging in anti-Indian activities and threatened them with dire consequences. His uncle namely, Sher Din and others including Choudhry Nawab Din, Chiri Mohammad, Haji Mohammad Hussain, Mohammad Sharif, Abdul Khaliq, Mistri Mohammad Amin, Nawab Din, Qasim Din, Sohbat Ali and 4 children were killed; others were rounded up, and brought to Sorul Camp for interrogation. During

the course of interrogation they were put to inhuman torture and were removed to Army Divisional Headquarters at Rajouri for further interrogation. Many of them could not stand the brutality and died on the spot. They include Mohammad Shafi, Alfoo and Chabi. Although some of them were set free but when they reached home they found their houses having been reduced to ashes.

Under these circumstances he and his companions decided to seek refuge in Azad Kashmir and accordingly crossed the cease-fire line.

*Statement of Sayed Latif Shah, son of Jafar Shah,  
resident of Dhanote Jaralan, Poonch;  
age 36 years*

He stated that he was a driver in India-held Kashmir. He was also an active worker of the Plebiscite Front and was President of its local branch. He was associated with Haji Fazal Hussain.

August 9, which is the anniversary of Sher-i-Kashmir Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah's deposition, was fixed for counter-action and when the day came, the people rose in armed revolt to undo the Indian occupation. He was entrusted the job of enlisting freedom fighters in his area which he did in spite of many difficulties.

One day, all of a sudden, the Indian army started firing on the villages of Chowa and Gordhan and killed many Muslims. The Indians also molested many Muslim girls. He further said that he took the people of his village to Kurhad village to join others who had already lined up against Indian troops. They remained engaged in this defensive fight for as long as two months compelling the enemy to withdraw from Dharhal. After Indo-Pak cease-fire, the enemy in a bid to recapture Dharhal, started genociding Muslim population. A number of Muslim girls were abducted. Many Muslims including Choudhry Karamatullah, Zaildar of Dharhal, were killed and their houses including his four houses were burnt. He suffered a loss of Rs. 100,000.

In these circumstances he crossed over to Azad Kashmir via Sohan Gali and is now residing at Mirpur.

*Statement of Choudhry Mohammad Alam, son  
of Pir Bukhsh, resident of Gundwa  
Budhal, District Poonch; age 30 years*

He stated that the local Jansanghi elements were against him because he was running a private school for religious teaching. They contended that in Kashmir, as a part of India, the Muslims could not have that much religious liberty. This interference in the religious affairs was resented by the Muslims. Subsequently the unilateral declaration claiming Kashmir as part of India sparked off a widespread revolt to overthrow the Indian occupation. But when after the cease-fire, the Indian army was disengaged from Sialkot and Lahore sectors, they attacked the areas with greater force. Narrating the story of the atrocities perpetrated on the Muslims, he said that the Indians caught hold of an old Muslim woman and ordered her to put off her clothes. She protested against this shameful and vulgar order but all these protestations fell on deaf ears. She was forcibly raped as a result of which she died. According to him, Hafiz Mian Abdullah, Choudhry Feroze Din, Choudhry Allah Din, Choudhry Chandi, Choudhry Faqir Din were also mercilessly killed. The Indian Jansanghis openly committed rape on young Muslim girls and killed them. A mosque was also desecrated. He further said that his own house was also set on fire.

*Statement of Choudhry Akbar, son of Choudhry Karam  
Din, resident of Bhera, District Poonch;  
age 53 years*

He had been closely associated with the freedom fighters right from 1947. During the recent rebellion the Indian army killed the civil population aided by militant Hindu organizations such as Jan Sangh. He is a witness to this savage drama. Eyes of Mandhi, son of Lala Gujar were torn out and his body was tied up with grass ropes and set on fire. His father was also severely beaten. Baga, son of Din Mohammad, and eight other Muslim residents of Gohland were locked in a house and burnt.

*Statement of Sardar Jalal-ud-Din, son of Mukhtiar  
Khan, resident of Kandi, District Poonch;  
age 58 years*

He said that he had been a member of the Revolutionary Council formed in 1947 and had organised revolutionary committees in the area. The re-arrest of Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah in 1965 created a great stir in the State. Sardar Jalal-ud-Din organised revolutionary committees at many places and made necessary administrative arrangements. A local Muslim volunteer corps had also been raised to deal with the situation. After cease-fire, some of the disengaged Indian forces were diverted from Sialkot and Lahore sectors and deployed in Rajouri sector. A reign of terror was let loose. The civil Muslim population was indiscriminately killed and property was looted and houses burnt. This resulted in the martyrdom of a great number of Muslims including the relatives of Sardar Jalal-ud-Din. Narrating the story of the slaughter of his relatives, Sardar Jalal-ud-Din burst into tears and said that Haji Jalal-ud-Din was killed ruthlessly. His eyes were torn and his right hand was chopped into pieces and later on he was deprived of his legs. This was how he was butchered to death. The same treatment was meted out to Raj Mohammad who was ultimately burnt alive. Continuing he further said that young Muslim girls were forcibly kidnapped, raped and killed.

*Statement of Jamal-ud-Din, son of Ghulam Mohammad,  
resident of Kandi, District Poonch;  
age 54 years*

The witness deposed that a dangerous situation was created in 1965 when India mounted an attack on Kashmir and the war of liberation started. Taking advantage of cease-fire, Indian colonialists ransacked villages, killed Muslims, molested womenfolk and destroyed lot of property. One morning it so happened that all the villages of Kandi were attacked by Indian troops. Pro-Pakistani slogans were raised to dupe the villagers and take them by surprise. Maulvi Noor Mohammad and 3 members of his family were burnt alive. His uncle Atta Mohammad, son of Shukker Din, also met the same fate.

*Statement of Choudhry Mohammad Sharif  
Tariq, B.A.L.L.B., resident of Kalaban,  
District Poonch; age 29 years*

The witness, Choudhry Mohammad Sharif Tariq, explained the circumstances leading to the 1965 uprising. He used to visit different places upto 13 August for organising resistance to the impending Indian action to suppress the rebellion. Haji Fazal Hussain had raised the banner of revolt from Proddi Gujran and he was appointed Administrator. He joined him and worked as liaison officer at Mairan from 16 to 22 August. The Indian military kidnapped two young Muslim girls of his village forcibly and molested them. They took out the eyes of one Noor-ud-Din and lynched him to death. His maternal uncle—Ghulam Mohammad—was severely beaten and after three days of continuous torture he was also killed. He further stated that his brother-in-law was taken into custody but he was not aware of his fate now. Similarly many people of Kalaban Band were meted out the same treatment and nearly 20 houses were burnt. House-to-house search was conducted for his arrest but they did not succeed. After 23 September, when cease-fire had taken place, the Indian army started genocide of Muslims on a large scale. The people abandoned their houses and took refuge in the adjoining forests. Continuing, he said that his whole property worth Rs. 29,500.00 was confiscated and he was rendered penniless. The houses of Muslims at Chiatar Kali, Lesina Bafliaz Smoot, Drabia Pooth Tian, Khira and other surrounding villages of Tehsil Mairan were ultimately burnt.

*Statement of Choudhry Sarwar Hussain Tariq, son of  
Maulana Mohammad Mohi-ud-Din Qadir,  
resident of Dhand-Kote, Tehsil Rajouri,  
District Poonch; age 28 years*

He stated that his father was a prominent worker of Muslim Conference enjoying confidence of his Gujar community. When, in August 1965, the revolt started under the directions of the Revolutionary Council, he joined the freedom fight. After Indo-Pak cease-

fire, the Indians diverted their attention to Kashmir. Their forces launched an intensive attack to quell the rebellion. They burnt Muslim houses, looted their property and abducted a large number of young Muslim girls. The breasts of young Muslim women were cut and their eyes taken out. Even small children were not spared of their wrath. The families of Haji Fazal Hussain, Haji Hassan Mohammad, Choudhry Niamatullah and Choudhry Maqbool were the worst sufferers. His maternal uncle, Choudhry Mohammad Bukhsh, was burnt alive. Similarly his uncles, Choudhry Lal Din and Choudhry Jalal Din were also brutally lynched until both of them expired. One of his cousins Latif Hussain—a student of 9th class—was also killed.

*Statement of Munshi Talib Hussain, son of Wazir  
Ali Shah, resident of Tehsil Mhender,  
District Poonch; age 45 years*

In August 1965, the Muslims of the State formed a Revolutionary Council in order to start an armed revolt against the unilateral declaration of merger. Munshi Talib Hussain and his associates formed a local revolutionary committee and set up their own local administration. After 20 days of the formation of the revolutionary committee some 300 Indian soldiers, equipped with modern arms, attacked the Headquarters of the revolutionary committee at village Daraba. During the operations, the Indian forces searched the houses of the Muslims and killed Mistri Lal Din, son of Khuda Bukhsh, Musahib Ali, son of Shah Wali Malik, Habib Ali, son of Shah Wali Malik, Noor Din son of Ilahi Bukhsh Gujar, Mohammad Din, son of Noor Din, wife of Mohammad Din and Abdul, son of Shera. When cease-fire was ordered, Indian forces engaged in Sialkot and Lahore sectors started pouring into Mhender for genocide of Muslims. An Indian army column of 1000 soldiers arrived on 25 September. It mounted three major attacks and killed a large number of Muslims, compelling the rest to abandon their villages. Their houses were burnt and property looted.

*Statement of Dilbar Khan, son of Faqir Khan,  
resident of village Rajdhani,  
Tehsil Rajouri*

It was August 1965 when suddenly the Indian Army attacked our village. They ordered us to come out of our homes. But as soon as we appeared, we were greeted by a battery of gun-fire as a result of which my son, Mohammad Yousaf, was killed on the spot. I was, later, arrested and subjected to severe torture so much so that my left hand was completely disabled. Later on they took away the daughter of Faqir Mohammad son of Sher Ali Lambardar of the village, and criminally assaulted her. They also threw grenades on us and killed three Muslims. In addition to this about 50 houses were burnt.

*Statement of Wazir Alam, son of Mian  
Abdullah, village Bala Kot,  
Tehsil Mendhar*

In December 1965 an Indian army unit attacked our village and killed 14 members of my family. After killing these innocent people for no fault of theirs, they destroyed our houses and set them on fire. Besides them, Mohammad Hussain, son of Sher Mohammad, Lumbardar of the village, was also murdered in a fit of the same frenzy. When his mother came to know of it and began to weep, a soldier shot her dead with a pistol. The house of Mando, son of Fateh, was burnt when all his family members were sleeping inside. When he came out of the blazing house, he was shot dead.

*Statement of Bagga son of Lala, resident of  
village Golad, Tehsil Mendhar,  
District Poonch*

In August 1965 the Indian Army attacked our village. When they arrived at my house, they caught hold of my brother and tore his eyes out of their sockets. He was then tied with a rope and burnt alive. They indiscriminately set fire to houses in the locality and killed whosoever came within their reach.

*Statement of Abdul Samad, son of Jamal Din,  
resident of village Suplla,  
Tehsil Mendhar*

On 26 September 1965, the Indian Army attacked my village. The first target was my house. They burnt two of my houses and one shop after divesting me of my belongings. Four persons living in the house, who could not escape, were burnt alive.

*Statement of Mohammad Shafi, son of Feroze  
Din, resident of village Baroot, Tehsil  
Mendhar, District Poonch*

In August 1965 a Sikh unit of the Indian Army attacked our village and burnt our houses. One of my neighbours, Hidayatullah, son of Kala, was taken into custody while he was engaged in grass cutting. His right hand was cut. When his children began to weep over this beastly act of the Indians, they cut his left hand and two legs; then came a bullet shot which instantaneously ended his life. The Indians then lynched his young son and daughter.

*Statement of Mst. Kali, widow of Wali Mohammad  
Shaheed, village Baroot, Tehsil Mendhar,  
District Poonch*

I am resident of village Baroot in Tehsil Mendhar. When Indian Army attacked our village, we vacated it and decided to take refuge in Azad Kashmir. While crossing the mountain pass the same Indian soldiers opened fire on us as a result of which my two daughters received serious injuries, while 32 persons including my husband died on the spot. Quite a number of our companions got wounded. There was molestation of young women, here and there, almost daily.

*Statement of Dana, widow of  
Qudratullah, village Baroot,  
Tehsil Mendhar*

One day an Indian Army unit came to my house whereupon I hid myself in the grass to evade them. The intruders shot down my

husband and later killed my two sons who were playing outside the house. In the evening when I went to my house, I was shocked to find the dead body of my daughter there.

*Statement of Channen Bibi, widow of  
Allah Ditta, village Sandote,  
Tehsil Mendhar*

I was living with 40 members of my family at village Sandote in Tehsil Mendhar, the India-held part of district Poonch. As the behaviour of Indian Army, posted in the area, towards Muslim community was openly hostile, we decided to leave our homes. On arriving at Gali which is at a distance of about 4 miles from our village, an Indian Army unit confronted us. They arrested about 40 persons and killed them by gun-fire. After killing the men they arrested five women including myself and took them to their camp at Baroot. They criminally assaulted us and then killed all except myself. I was subjected to physical torture. They brutally cut down my arm with a knife and then threw me out to let me die. But providence had ordained otherwise; I survived and succeeded in crossing over to Azad Kashmir.

*Statement of Hamid Loon, son of Abdullah Loon,  
resident of Highhama, Tehsil Hindwara,  
age 46 years*

Before migration, I had gone to Srinagar for buying food stuffs. When I returned home I found that the Indian Army had besieged the village and Muslims of Srinagar had risen in revolt. Indian Army was burning village after village compelling the Muslims to take refuge in forests. The indiscriminate killing of Muslims had become the order of the day. In one of the villages, breasts of three Muslim women had been cut. Nails were fixed in the hands and feet of five innocent children. I witnessed Sidpir and his son being killed in village Drigmoula. In Kasheera, a religious head named Mohammad Amin, who had four unmarried girls, was shot dead. His daughters were

abducted by the Indian Army personnel. Two of these girls were seen taken away next day towards hospital. Two had died as a result of rape committed on them throughout the night. The other two girls were also meted out the same treatment and were bleeding.

*Statement of Mohammad Ramzan, son of  
Mohammad Abdullah, resident of  
Azamabad; age 29 years*

He stated that his neighbour, Ghulam Qader, son of Jamal Joo, Qadir Joo and his wife and two children, aged 8 and 4 years and one daughter aged two and a half years, were locked in a house and set on fire by the Indian Army.

*Statement of Master Mir Hussain, son of  
Khawaja Ghulam Joo, resident of  
Challa Dangri*

I was a school teacher in Challa Dangri. In 1965 many Muslims were put to death in my presence by the Indian Army which included Fetha Mohammad, son of Maulvi Ilim Din. In village Jallian Muslims were ordered to get into their houses and, as soon as they did so, they were burnt alive. About 30 young girls were taken into custody; their whereabouts are not known.

*Statement of Shabbir Ahmad, son of  
Sikandar Shah, resident of  
Rajouri; age 25 years*

The witness stated that he was a senior teacher in a Rajouri school. Rajouri was Divisional Headquarter under the command of a Sikh General who controlled and conducted the genocidal operations. During the operations Haji Ibrahim, Jamat Ali, son of Haji Hussain Bakhsh, Sahib Din and Ghulam Hussain Chowkidar were burnt alive in their own houses. His grandfather—Pir Haider Shah—was also killed along with Maulvi Mohammad Hussain, Abdur Rashid

Tehsildar, Karamat Ullah Zaildar and Maulvi Mohammad Hafeez. His mother and cousin were taken away by the military and their whereabouts are not yet known to him. In the month of October, 1965, while he was running in quest of safety, he came across eleven dead bodies of Muslims lying near the High School, Darhal. Again, near Raiki Illaqa Darhal, he saw about 35 dead bodies, including 15 women victims. At Sian Gungi, on the bank of river Chenab, he saw yet another heap of dead bodies. In the evening when he reached Thana Road, he saw a dump of about 200 dead bodies. Near Miran Wali Bawali, he saw many more bodies.

*Statement of Faqir Mohammad,  
son of Nasar, resident of  
Sadian; age 60 years*

The witness stated that the Indian Army used to call for young Muslim girls at their pickets; anybody who dared to refuse was killed. His son-in-law Faqira, son of Gharibu, aged 26, who was an educated young man, was also asked to comply with their demand and, on his refusal, was put to death in his (witness's) house. He further stated that a young girl Mst. Zabi, wife of Feroze Din, was working in her fields when some Indian soldiers pounced upon her. As she raised hue and cry, her husband and one Majid came for rescue but both of them were killed by a brandishing sword. The face of Mst. Zabi was blackened and her breast was cut off. When one Am-Kala Lone, aged 25, tried to rescue her, he was shot dead. One Saddar Din also met the same fate. Samad Lone was Lambardar of village Gigrian. He was also directed to supply young Muslim girls and, on his refusal, his hands were cut and eyes taken out.

*Statement of Miss Zainib Bano, Principal,  
Girls Intermediate College,  
Muzaffarabad (Azad Kashmir)*

I belong to Srinagar. According to my knowledge 250,000 Indian troops are posted in Occupied Kashmir. In addition to this, there are Central Reserve Police, Bihar Police, Punjab Police and

Kashmir Armed Police. I was posted in Zaina Kadal Girls College as Professor of Biology. During the catastrophe of 1965, the Khanqah of Kishtwar was set on fire. Terror was let loose throughout the Valley in August, 1965. As a protest, students of Higher Secondary School Noakadal alongwith Degree and Higher Secondary students of other colleges staged demonstrations. The Indian Army opened fire on a procession which resulted in the death of a number of students whose dead bodies were not handed over to their kith and kin. Only the dead body of Khurshid, who was leading the procession, was made available after a great struggle. I was also accompanying the procession . . . The Batamalu had been blown up, and the survivors of the tragedy were groaning in the wilderness in Gol Bagh. All the outlets of the city of Srinagar had been plugged with military pickets. Permanent military and police posts had been installed in all the educational institutions to suppress any rising of the Muslim youth. From my relatives I learnt that Achha Bal and Pampore villages were set on fire. So far as I know, about three to four hundred Muslims were put to death in Srinagar alone. In 1958 about 1600 Muslims were shot dead at the time of Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah's re-arrest.

### MAULANA FARUQUE'S STATEMENT

According to a statement issued on 9 October 1968, Maulana Mohammad Faruque, said that during his arrest in 1965, third degree methods were used against him by the authorities. In a statement released by the People's Action Committee of Jammu and Kashmir at Srinagar, the Maulana said that he was tortured, abused, maltreated and forced to stay awake during the period of his detention by the police authorities of the puppet regime of Mr. Sadiq. He said he was arrested on the night of 9-10 October, 1965, and was placed in a Jammu special jail. He was removed to another house on October 21. On November 16, he was whisked away in a closed jeep and was placed in a small underground cell where he was subjected to inhuman treatment for 50 days. The Maulana said: "It was dark and dingy cell secured with iron bars but with no windows." The same cell had to be used as latrine. Armed Police stood guard outside the cell.



*Abdul Majid son of Sian (12 years) refugee from village Dawason, Tehsil Rajouri, was captured by an Indian patrol near the cease-fire line while he was about to cross the border into Azad Kashmir. He received bullet wounds on his nose, right arm and right leg.*



*A batch of fresh Muslim evictees from Occupied Kashmir is trekking towards Azad Kashmir in search of food and shelter.*





*In the middle : Mohammad Razak, son of Abdul Aziz (12 years) refugee from village Phorah, Tehsil Mendhar, Indian-held Poonch, was hit by an Indian bullet in his left arm. In bed : Mohammad Khalik, son of Dost Mohammad, (15 years) refugee from village Kala Ban. Indian-held Poonch whose legs were fractured when an Indian soldier tried to gun him down. Standing : Mohammad Alam, son of Karim Baksh (34 years) refugee from village Balnoi, Tehsil Mendhar, lost his left foot when Indian artillery men opened gun fire on Muslims fleeing to Azad Kashmir.*



*Kashmiri Muslim refugees in a camp at Gujar Khan, near Rawalpindi.*



*A Kashmiri woman with her child and all her earthly belongings looking at her burning village—for the last time—from across the Pakistan border. The Indians did not spare anyone; they hounded out weeping mothers and groaning children from their ancestral homes to take refuge in Pakistan.*



*Moti Begum wife of Mohammad Akbar (28 years) refugee from village Draba, Tehsil Mendhar was badly hit in her right shoulder by Indian shell fire while crossing the cease-fire line.*



*A group of orphan children and widows from village Dharal, Tehsil Rajouri, are seen taking shelter at Kotli Transit Camp soon after their arrival in Azad Kashmir on the last day of Indo-Pakistan war in September 1965.*



*A blind and 105-year old Kashmiri refugee woman in a Pakistani camp, without her young grand-daughters.*

"I was searched in a most uncivilised manner and my personal effects were snatched away before I was thrown in the dark cell. For about 20 days, I was not allowed to sleep and cold water was often thrown on my face when I felt drowsy. High-powered electric bulbs dazzled my eyes. The moment drowsiness overtook me, so much noise was made that, I could not take even a nap. I was abused in a shameless manner. My eyesight was badly affected and eventually I fell ill." Maulana Faruque said that one day he lost consciousness due to illness and had to be removed to the Sadar Hospital in Jammu, where he was kept under armed guard. He said although his relatives tried their best to meet him in the jail they were not allowed to do so. The only man who saw him for a few minutes was his late brother. The Maulana said that his health was shattered due to this inhuman treatment in the prison.

## A FOREIGN WITNESS

A leading French correspondent of *Le Figaro* who personally visited the refugee camps at Garhi Dopatta Rara, Kahigala, Hajira and Pallandri in Azad Kashmir cabled the following report on 1 October, 1965: "We have just arrived in one of those refugee camps hastily set up beyond the Kashmir cease-fire line to greet the civilians running away from the Indian troops. A guerilla warfare has developed in the part of Kashmir held by the Indians, during the two months and since then, for the poor villagers, the victories of the freedom fighters are but stories of villages set on fire, raped women and death. A furious young man takes my arm and tell me the story of his village, Mandi, somewhere near Poonch. The Indians cut the throats of our daughters and exposed them, saying 'here is your Pakistan'. Seven members of my family have been taken away and slaughtered by the soldiers, he said with tears in his eyes. Others continued the story: 'they have shut the people in their houses before setting them on fire. The whole village was burnt down. This morning I visited another village and heard the same story. One of these miserable men with a beard told me: 'Eighteen days ago, the Indians launched an attack on our village. After midnight, they succeeded in entering the village and burning all the houses, killing

everybody they saw." He added that he had succeeded in running away with his wife, his two sons and his daughter. He did not know if anyone else had survived. Thousands of refugees are arriving in Azad Kashmir telling the same story. It seems that the Indians are trying to clean up the area on the other side of the cease-fire line by killing or chasing away the villagers."

## TESTIMONY FROM INDIA

When Batamalu—a predominantly Muslim inhabited mohalla of Srinagar—was set on fire in August, 1965, the Indian Government came out with an announcement accusing some unknown 'Pakistani infiltrators' of espionage. But the survivors, after the catastrophe, who had assembled in Gol Bagh vehemently protested to the Government authorities for shifting the blame to non-existent elements. The myth of Pakistani infiltrators has been exploded by evidence borne out by a number of neutral observers from India. Notable among them are Miss Miridula Sarabhai and Mrs. Vimla Devi—India's social workers of recognized integrity. This conflagration, which was started by Indian troops, consumed 437 houses and three mosques. More than 4,000 people were rendered homeless, as Batamalu was burning; two civilians, one of them a Sikh, who wanted to salvage their belongings, were shot at by the Indian troops. He was burnt alive. Next day the eye-witness discovered the charred body of a Muslim woman from the debris. Chatabal met the same fate, the following day, as well as all the adjoining areas where the population was hundred per cent Muslim. These localities were sealed by the army and then set on fire. The fire brigade was not allowed access to the burning houses.

The Indian Army had sprinkled petrol on houses through pipes in the entire Batamalu area and then set it on fire. This account was given by an eye-witness who managed to leave Srinagar and reach Muzaffarabad. The eye-witness, who is a foreigner, said that it was the worst case of arson and incendiarism in the history of the town. The Indian Army, he added, did not allow the fire brigade to extinguish the fire. In some cases fleeing victims

were pushed back to be roasted alive. He said that the Batamalu area was vacated under the orders of the Indian Army at 11.45 in the forenoon of August 14. The Indians then soaked all the houses with petrol. Before setting the area on fire, they stood guard on all the points leading to it and, after a specified time, those who still remained inside were not permitted to come out because the area was declared as 'sealed off'. As the flames from the area leapt up, the Indian soldiers fired indiscriminately in all directions. Next morning, he said, the charred bodies of a number of persons were recovered.

A prominent worker of Serva Sangh of India, Mrs. Vimla Devi Thakur, has reported to her organization that the Indian forces in Occupied Kashmir were persecuting the Muslim population on a large scale. Giving impressions of her visit to Mandi town in Poonch district and Surankot, she said: "The sad and pathetic story of Mandi's destruction by the Indian Army in August, 1965, the subsequent mopping-up operations and victimisation of poor people out of political prejudice, indiscriminate and ruthless use of the Defence of India Rules, inhuman torture of people in interrogation centres and the reign of terror prevailing in the area are things which may sound incredible and yet they are true. Though I had heard a number of cases about the torture committed in the interrogation centres, I had also heard about the atrocities and brutalities of the Indian Army in the mopping-up operations in Rajouri, but I had not heard cases like these: Mr. Karamat Ullah, a very well-known and rich person of Darhal, who received the Indian Army on behalf of the villagers, was arrested and told that he would be released on giving Rs. 6,000.00 to military officers. He went to his home and brought that amount, which he handed over to the officers concerned. Despite this, his wife and daughter-in-law were arrested, taken to the Police Station and raped by the officers of Kumaon Regiment No. 11. After three days, both the ladies were shot dead. Then came the turn of Karamat Ullah himself. He was tortured and humiliated in a number of ways. His clothes were taken away and chilly powder was inserted into his rectum and a bamboo inserted into his throat. He was kept groaning for hours. Similarly, another Muslim of the same village, Amanullah, who was much respected by his people, was

tied upside down by Army officers. His wife and daughter-in-law were raped in the Police Station for three days in the presence of his son who was tied down to a post in the same room. All the three were shot and their bodies were thrown into a stream. Amanullah was later murdered lest the news should escape the valley and reach the people. Likewise, an old peasant woman was brought to Army camp and raped. In the end, petrol was sprinkled on her and set on fire. There are eye-witnesses who saw the unfortunate woman running to her village. She became unconscious and fell down midway. The villagers, however, managed to extinguish the fire. The poor woman could survive only for five days. Captain Kundan, Deputy Commissioner of Rajouri, has himself seen the woman dying."

## APPENDIX II

*In India there are dissenters who have challenged the official, avowed policy on Kashmir. They are in a minority but, nevertheless, they are there and include in their ranks some eminent national figures. Their conscience has set them at loggerheads with their own government and the common run of public opinion. Their views are based on the conviction that the ruling party is acting unwisely and unjustly. They have warned India of India's folly; their admonitory statements are seldom heeded by their Government but the very least they can do and are doing is to encourage doubts and present the other side of the picture.*

*So far as the world at large is concerned, there are no two opinions anywhere about India's stand on Kashmir. Ever since the inception of the trouble, twentyone years ago, numerous comments on India's Kashmir policy have appeared in newspapers throughout the world. The world press has been consistently condemning India's callous disregard of international opinion and democratic aspirations of the Kashmiri people. The strictures passed on India are legion; it is all common knowledge and need not be reproduced here.*

## TWO INDIAS

For more than twenty years the Indian government has been actively engaged in elaborating a fictional thesis on Kashmir. Ostensibly an attempt to hoodwink people at home and elsewhere, it is more like an exercise in self-deception. Like a juggernaut, the Indian Government first rode down the hapless Kashmiris and then smilingly proclaimed to the world that all was well in Kashmir and that the people of Kashmir had given their verdict in favour of India. The people abroad were never taken in, and even in India there were some who thought that their government was in error.

As years rolled by, Sheikh Abdullah's arrest in 1953 made nonsense of India's pronouncements on Kashmir. Those who did not see eye to eye with their government on this issue became even more vocally articulate. There are many among the intelligentsia and enlightened Indian politicians who have censured their Government's policy in Kashmir. Some have been vehement, some moderate and a few, like General Cariappa, merely wishful . . .

There are some who have gone back on their words; having repeatedly stated that it was wrong to claim that the Kashmir issue was already settled and accession was final and irrevocable, Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan, the Indian Sarvodaya leader, staged a remarkable volte-face. He has now brazenly declared that a plebiscite is out of question and Kashmir is an integral part of India. Similarly, in 1964, Mr. Minoo Masani, General Secretary of the Swatantra party, first said that fresh elections should be held in Occupied Kashmir to get a "mandate from the people" on future relations of the State with India, Pakistan and other nations. Two weeks later, Mr. Masani, in another statement, stoutly denied having ever advocated a plebiscite to determine whether Kashmir should accede to India or Pakistan.

Mr. Dayabhai Patel, who was leader of Swatantra group in Rajya Sabha (Upper House of the Indian Parliament), is perhaps the only Indian politician to suggest that India should give up Kashmir, plebiscite or no plebiscite. He is the son of late Sardar Patel. He said in July 1964 that India should give up Kashmir "for good" because the question has been allowed to remain unsettled for a long time "and over 200 crores were being spent on Kashmir annually. It is better to cut off the rot." No one else in India appears to have suggested so drastic a solution. There has been, however, no lack of strongly-worded condemnations. Acharia Kripalani, leader of the Indian Swatantra Party, said in November, 1964, that India had been so thoroughly exposed that she dare not face the U.N. again.

Similarly, Mr. S. M. Joshi, Chairman of the Praja Socialist Party of India said at Kanpur (April, 1964) that the wishes of the people of Kashmir should be ascertained to solve the Kashmir problem and India should honour her promise of holding a plebiscite after the cease-fire. He added: "It is sad that we have not fulfilled the undertaking. Our position has been falsified in international politics."

## TWO WOMEN

Two prominent Indian women, Miss Mridula Sarabhai, well-known disciple of Gandhi and Mrs. Kulsum Sayani, a veteran feminist leader, have shattered the Indian case in Kashmir in their letters published in the *Indian Express* (May 14, 1965). Brushing aside Indian pretensions to pacifist settlement of the dispute, Mrs. Sayani recalled the Indian Prime Minister's message to President Ayub to "settle all our disputes by peaceful negotiations" and "yet our next step was to adopt measures which would indicate as if the Kashmir problem did not exist." She posed the question: "Do such acts dissolve the problem which is known to all the world and which we ourselves were responsible for taking to the U.N."

Here are some excerpts from Miss Mridula Sarabhai's letter:

"Your editorial, "Abdullah's Spokesmen" (May 14) deals with the handouts I circulate to moulders of public opinion and policy-

framers in Delhi. The idea that these are being issued for propaganda is baseless. Whenever the press has been allowed to function without censorship, oral or written, and it voices the Kashmiri people's cry for justice, there is no need for such handouts. But when there is an effort on the one side to create false impressions outside, I feel it is a national duty to share the facts with all concerned . . . The local press has been gagged; the question is: Why this eagerness to make all believe that 'not a dog barked' when Sheikh Abdullah was arrested and that Kashmiris are temperamentally meek and will submit to whatever is done to them? This wrong assessment of a popular movement is in itself proof of how cut off the rulers are from the people. If the situation was handled sympathetically and if the Press and Radio were allowed to play their legitimate role of voicing popular grievances there would be no need for special bulletins to be issued.

"The vast difference between the Government version and the popular version of such events arises from an age-long attitude especially when, in following the 'firm and hard line', the authorities create a shell of 'I see not, I hear not and I speak not' atmosphere around themselves. They hedge it with such steps as (1) suppression of local newspapers which publish local events as they see them (in Kashmir 10 newspapers have been closed down and a few editors are in detention); (2) and oral warnings to the local correspondents of the outside press to send only despatches endorsed by the authorities. In these circumstances how can anyone find out the facts?

"My plea is: Don't close the case until you hear and assess the data from the complainant also. The central agencies of law and order are at work in Kashmir. Every lathi, every shot, every indiscriminate detention and harassment is attributed to India and becomes one more stroke for undermining the very foundation of emotional integration for which all this is being done.

"You have referred in your editorial to bulletins reaching diplomatic missions etc. And the 'damage' they do. Hundreds of foreign visitors are in Kashmir, eye-witnesses to what is happening and feeling the pulse of the people."

In a letter published in *Indian Express* of Bombay (1 June, 1965) Miss Mridula Sarabhai strongly criticised the views recently expressed by Mir Qasim. Here are some excerpts from her letter :

"Mr. Frank Moraes, in his "Report on Kashmir-II" (June 8), has quoted Mir Qasim as saying that "so long as the Government of India does not adopt and declare a firm unequivocal policy on Kashmir, things will remain in the melting pot" and, to substantiate this, Mr. Qasim has blamed Indian leaders for defreezing the Kashmir problem and putting it into the melting pot. He holds that "firmness pays". It is surprising how even recent history has been wrongly interpreted and read. It is an admitted fact that the emotional upheaval at the time of the theft of the holy relic in 1963 was basically an eruption of political discontent. It was a revolt against prevailing conditions.

The theory that the time factor will solve these problems has also failed. The 'policy of firmness' is not only failing but is creating a very dangerous situation because we cannot solve these issues. The Government wants to coerce the people of Kashmir into declaring that a solution has been arrived at. For argument's sake, let us say that this is accepted but how does it change the local situation and the problems that confront the people? This can be visualised only when one places oneself in the place of the Kashmiri, staying in a border State and in a warlike atmosphere. The consequences that arise out of the refusal to accept the existence of the Kashmir dispute will be felt, sooner or later, irrespective of what attitude the State Government and the Government of India take. It is a cancer that has to be treated by tackling the cause but, if you ignore it, one knows what happens."

### MR. RAJAGOPALACHARI

A few months after the 1965 war the Indian Swatantra Party leader, Mr. Rajagopalachari, warned the Indian Government to give up its rigid stand on Kashmir if it wanted to break India's present diplomatic isolation in the world. In two articles published in his weekly *Swarajya*, the former Governor-General of India said that it

was wholly "unfair for the Congress Parliamentary Party to attribute the defeat of India's cause to lack of energy and diplomatic or forensic talent among our foreign embassies". He said: "They may have many shortcomings but these are not at the root of our diplomatic defeat—for to defeat it is to have all the world nations, except Soviet Russia, against us by our own confession.

"Even Soviet Russia refuses now to adopt a very clear Indian line. The diplomatic failure has to be explained not by imputing faults to our representatives or malice to world powers, but by something in the very nature of the problem and the manner in which we have tackled it all these years". Mr. Rajagopalachari said that to persist in maintaining that Kashmir was an internal affair of India would not help matters. If we were so sure that Kashmir is an integral part of India, it would not require to be repeated so often like my lady's excessive protest. Even more firmly accepted truths in the physical sciences have been modified by subsequent investigation. Let there be no dogmatism about the liquid truths in political life".

Mr. Rajagopalachari maintained that the "two important and worthy aims" before them were to settle the Kashmir problem according to the free opinion of its people and to develop friendly relations and co-operation between Pakistan and India. He agreed with the United States President that the United Nations 'should achieve prestige and strength by successfully tackling a major dispute' like Kashmir. He said a settlement of the Kashmir dispute would certainly be a great achievement for the United Nations.

According to Indian press reports, Mr. Rajagopalachari's outspoken views on Kashmir roused great anger among Congressmen and Hindu fanatics. The Madras Chief Minister, Mr. M. Bhaktavatsalam, said that the State Government was aware of certain responsible leaders expressing views likely to affect the nation's defence efforts and warned that action would be taken against them.



## TWO INTELLECTUALS

In April, 1967, two Indian intellectuals, Mr. T. N. Zutshi and E. P. Menon, prepared a report on the "Kashmir Problem" and submitted it to the Indian Prime Minister and a few others. They gave a 'graphic account of the happenings in the held territory and demanded immediate and unconditional release of political leaders and workers in detention. They also urged the restoration of civil liberties in the Indian Occupied Kashmir and stressed the holding of a joint meeting of the representatives of both India and Pakistan and leaders of various political parties in Jammu and Kashmir, including Azad Kashmir, for thrashing out a peaceful and honourable solution of this most agonizing problem.

Quoting a member of the Sikh community of Occupied Kashmir they wrote in their report: "An elderly Sikh gentleman, 80-year old, who has spent his life in Kashmir medical service and risen to the highest position in that service and has travelled in many countries of the world, when talking to us of India's present position in Kashmir, pointedly said: "We are in Kashmir just as the Americans are in Vietnam". Referring to Sufi Nazir Ahmad, a prominent Muslim mystic divine of Kashmir, they said Sufi Nazir Ahmad was of the view that "no one even partially acquainted with the Jammu and Kashmir problem, can ever believe that Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah and others of his views urged "accession" to the Indian Union, permanent or provisional, in order to convert the State into a Hindu majority province by driving out large numbers of Muslims.

"This is what has been continuously happening since the day Jammu and Kashmir was occupied by India. A comparison between the census figures of the ratio of Muslim and non-Muslim population of the State before 1947 and after, would be enough to remove whatever doubts some people may have regarding the veracity of my statement. I would like to say a word here only about the district and the province of Jammu. The percentage of Muslim population in Jammu district before 1947 was 56 per cent. There are, however, hardly 20 per cent Muslims today in Jammu district. As for the province of Jammu as a whole, it is difficult to give an exact figure since the

number of Muslims killed or driven out during last year's upheaval is unknown. The fact is that an organised group has been at work since 1947 with a well thought-out programme of driving the Muslims out of the entire State of Jammu and Kashmir or at least from a major part of it. Even the Indian Government appears incapable of taking any step to stop their nefarious activities and establish permanent peace in the State. Being satisfied with their success in Jammu province, these people have now turned to Kashmir proper and have selected the district of Doda for their activities.

"Recently, during my short stay in Jammu while returning from Kashmir, I was told that they are busy these days in getting signatures of the people of Doda on a memorandum which declares that inclusion of the district of Doda in Kashmir proper was contrary to the "secular spirit" of the Indian Constitution. This claim is being made notwithstanding the fact that Doda is a part of Kashmir proper both linguistically and culturally and has, at least up till now, an absolute Muslim majority." Sufi Nazir Ahmad further said: "In the face of this conspiracy to drive out all Muslims from Jammu and Kashmir it is natural that the Muslim population should look towards Pakistan with hope. The question arises as to who is responsible for creating this pro-Pakistan sentiment in the Muslim population of the State. At least one clear answer to this question is that the group which has made it difficult for the Muslims to live in this State is wholly responsible for it. Had the policy of the Jammu and Kashmir 'government' been directed since 1947 towards ensuring safety of Muslim lives and property as well as of the majority status of the Muslims of the State, the political realities, not only pertaining to Indo-Kashmir relations but also to the situation prevailing in India and Pakistan would have been entirely different and the impact of this would have been of quite a different nature on the political situation . . ."

## A WRITER SPEAKS

When Sheikh Abdullah was still in jail, an Indian writer, Dilip Mukerjee, contributed an article captioned, "Constructive Role Awaits Abdullah" to the *Statesman* of New Delhi. According to him: "The political leadership in New Delhi has also had to reckon with the fact that the Kashmir problem is an international concern

regardless of the legal position adopted by our leaders that it is our domestic affair”.

“During Mrs. Indira Gandhi’s visit abroad, she is believed to have been reminded both by Mr. Kosygin and President Tito of the need to put our own house in order in Kashmir. The reminder stemmed primarily from the stake these friendly nations have in India’s stability which remains highly vulnerable until the Kashmir problem is sorted out. The prompting of these friends gained added urgency because of the pleas made to them by Pakistan. Not surprisingly, Pakistani Government and press have sought to make a test of India’s ability to live up to its commitments under the Tashkent Declaration. Some might be tempted to argue that Pakistan had no *locus standi vis-a-vis* Kashmir. But this is to fly in the face of facts. Even the Soviet Union, which from 1955 onwards took the position that Kashmir was an integral part of India, has had to soften its position after 1963 when we went into six rounds of talks with Pakistan in search of a *modus vivendi*. To suggest that the failure of the talks plus the armed conflict of 1965 have put Pakistan permanently out of the count will not do. It would be contrary to the spirit of Tashkent to which we proclaim our adherence day by day”.

Dilip Mukerjee added: “Implicit in the decision to release Sheikh Abdullah is the assumption that a dialogue with him will now be resumed. Any realist will have to recognise that the setting in which Nehru and Sheikh Abdullah discussed the problem has changed in the three years . . . The international community retains interest in Kashmir problem because of its implications for the stability and peace in the subcontinent. But it wants the issue to be negotiated but not fought over. Fighting is even otherwise ruled out. This sets a limit to the dialogue, meaning that a solution must be found by mutual consent. The best that one can hope for is a readjustment of the Indian position to assure the Kashmiri people full opportunities for self-expression”.

Dilip Mukerjee concluded: “Whatever judgment Sheikh Abdullah may have arrived at for himself, it is clear that a fairly long period will have to intervene between his release and substantive negotiations. He will need all this time to re-establish himself in Kash-

mir’s political life. The communal polarisation taking place in the State threatens the Sheikh’s position as much as it threatens India. A great deal of political stamina is going to be needed to face up to the Sheikh’s demagoguery.”

## FACE THE PEOPLE

An Indian intellectual, Mr. R. V. Raghavan of Bombay, urged the Indian Government to settle the Kashmir dispute according to the UN resolutions. In a letter to the Editor of the weekly *Himmat* of Bombay, which appeared in its issue of 20 October, 1967, Mr Raghavan wrote: “I read your article ‘India and Pakistan’ wherein you have emphasised the need to settle our differences with our neighbour. You have, however, discreetly left out the main point of dispute between the two countries—Kashmir. Unless this thorny question is settled, there can never be any friendly relationship between us.” Criticising India’s military occupation of Kashmir and its unrealistic approach to this vital problem, he asked the Indian Government: “Why does not the Indian Government give up its false prestige and seek a settlement of this basic question with Pakistan? Let the Government of India agree to hold a plebiscite. The plebiscite can be held under UN auspices. Let both Pakistani and Indian troops withdraw and let the UN forces supervise the plebiscite.

“If, as the Indian leaders claim, the people of Kashmir are for remaining with India, why are they afraid of facing the people. On the contrary, if the Kashmiris wish to join Pakistan, our holding on to Kashmir with the help of our military might is meaningless.” Praising Pakistan’s foreign policy and her cordial relationship with the neighbouring countries, Mr. Raghavan observed: “All our fears that if Kashmir goes to Pakistan that may pose a threat to India or that Pakistan may embark upon a fresh campaign of aggression are unfounded. Pakistan has also got to respect international law. After all, they have no territorial disputes with Iran, Afghanistan, China, or Burma; if they can live in peace with all these neighbours, certainly they will live in peace with their neighbour India also. We will seek an assurance from Pakistan that once the Kashmir question is settled, she has no further territorial claims on India. I am sure this assurance will be forthcoming.”

## OUR GREAT OPPORTUNITY IN KASHMIR\*

by

JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN

The story of Kashmir is an account of confused aims, unsure methods, insincere ideals. From the beginning, Kashmir has been the Prime Minister's concern. Yet when Sheikh Abdullah was dismissed from the Prime Ministership and detained, Mr. Nehru happened to know of the event just as any other Indian citizen did. That is only one example of the incredible manner in which the Kashmir question has been handled. The present ballyhoo over Sheikh Abdullah's statements raises the doubt if the old story was not going to be repeated again. After 11 years of dilly-dallying the Sheikh was at last released. But again there seems to be no well thought-out policy behind that belated decision. Surprise and pain have been expressed at Sheikh Saheb's statement. Unless the gentlemen concerned had deliberately hidden their heads in the sand, they could have saved themselves these emotional upsets. Sheikh Abdullah has said nothing that was not expected from him.

What, after all, is the substance of Sheikh Abdullah's statements? This, that the future of Kashmir has to be decided by the people of Kashmir, and that it has to be done in a manner that the dispute about it between India and Pakistan is amicably ended. With a little imagination it was possible to see that this clear and principled stand of the Kashmir leader opened for India a wonderful opportunity that could be exploited to the advantage of all concerned. What actually is happening, however, is parrot-like reiteration of slogans that carry no conviction in any dispassionate quarters. One of these slogans is that the accession of Kashmir to India is final and irrevocable. The Sheikh has questioned that, and it is for impartial lawyers to decide the issue. But the vital point to keep in mind is that it is not by legal advocacy that a human problem like that of Kashmir can ever be settled. Indeed it was such realization that had prompted the original promise of the Prime Minister to ascertain the wishes of the people. At this point two further slogans are raised: (a) the people of Kashmir

have already expressed their will at three general elections; (b) if the people of Kashmir are allowed to express their will, it will be the beginning of the end of the Indian nation.

Both, to my mind, are baseless slogans. The elections in Kashmir after Sheikh Abdullah's arrest were neither fair nor free. If that has to be disproved, it can be done by an impartial inquiry and not just by official assertions. I may be lacking in patriotism or other virtues, but it has always seemed to me to be a lie to say that the people of Kashmir had already decided to integrate themselves with India. They might do so, but have not done so yet. Apart from the quality of the elections, the future of the State of Jammu and Kashmir was never made an electoral issue at any of them. Lastly, if we are so sure of the verdict of the people, why are we so opposed to giving them another opportunity to reiterate it? The answer given is that this would start the process of disintegration of the country. Few things have been said in the course of this controversy more silly than this one. The assumption behind the argument is that the States of India are held together by force and not by the sentiment of a common nationality.

The last and final slogan raised in the ballyhoo is that there is no Kashmir question at all, and that if there was one at any time, it has now been settled once for all. Kashmir is a part of India and that is a fact of history, they say. That, I think, is the worst form of auto-suggestion. Of all the amazing statements made in the course of this controversy the one by the 27 Congress MPs (including the Secretary of the Congress Party and other important members) would easily take the prize. Coming to Kashmir, this is how they authoritatively summed up the position: "You can no more talk of self-determination in the case of Kashmir than in the case of, say, Bombay or Bihar." Further on they said: "After the Americans attained independence, was any State allowed to exercise the so-called right of self-determination?" Surely, Congress MPs know better. Then why this deliberate obfuscation? Is the answer far to find?

When partition was agreed upon, it was decided that what was known as British India would be divided according to Muslim and Hindu majority areas (without any referendum) and that in Princely

*\*A summary of two articles published by New Delhi's "Hindustan Times" in 1964.*

India the Princes would have the option to accede to either India or Pakistan. Thus there was no question of any referendum in Bihar or Bombay. As to the Princely States, the accession of the Prince was to be final. So, when Maharaja Hari Singh of Kashmir acceded to India, that should have set the matter beyond doubt for all times, as indeed in strict law it actually did. But there was a snag: the accession had to be accepted. And it was precisely at that point that the idea of referendum or self-determination in regard to Kashmir was injected into the course of events.

At this point it might help to clarify matters to consider another variation of the theme, though it was not the theme of the 27 MPs. Briefly, it is this; true, there was a proviso added to the Instrument of Accession, but that has already been given effect to and there is nothing further to be done about it. The proviso was carried out, it is said, when the Kashmir Constituent Assembly adopted in 1956 a Constitution which declared that "the State of Jammu and Kashmir is and shall be an integral part of India." That was three years after Sheikh Abdullah's arrest, but that may not be considered so important. The really important point is that a decision of the Constituent Assembly cannot be equated with a referendum, which the Prime Minister had solemnly pledged. Statements of Sheikh Abdullah are handled to prove that he himself had accepted the accession. But there never was any question about it. Following the Maharaja's legal act of accession, the Sheikh and the National Conference had endorsed and explicitly accepted the accession; and on many subsequent occasions their acceptance was reiterated. All that is incontestable. Yet the proviso remained and had to take effect. Neither the National Conference nor Sheikh Abdullah could take the place of the people of Kashmir whose will had to be ascertained and not the Sheikh's or that of the National Conference.

Still another argument is that since Pakistan joined SEATO and CENTO and the U.S.A. supplied it arms, and other things happened, the situation became so transformed that the offer of referendum stood no longer. But it is forgotten that it was not to Pakistan that the offer or pledge had been given but to the people of Kashmir. There could be no justification for punishing the latter for the actions of the

former. In view of all this it appears to me that the right and constructive approach is not to deny to Kashmir the right of self-determination or to assert that the right had already been exercised, but to show rationally how impractical and imprudent it would be to exercise that right now.

Before concluding I wish to take a look at our secularism in relation to Kashmir. Apart from other considerations, Kashmir is deemed to be of great value to us because we wish to hold it up as an example of our secularism. But suppose we had to keep the Muslims of Kashmir within India by force; would that also be an example of our secularism? The very question exposes its absurdity.

### APPENDIX III

*India's volte-face on Kashmir is one of the most glaring cases of dishonest behaviour by a country which claims to be 'democratic' and 'secular'. For years India kept telling the world that the fate of Kashmir will be decided by the Kashmiris themselves. One has only to recall some of these assurances to see how seriously India had once committed itself to a free plebiscite and how unconscionably it spurns it now. There are several thousand words, solemnly spoken and neatly printed in Indian and world newspapers, which barricade all approaches to escape-alleys improvised by Indians. As the ultimate objective of all the Security Council resolutions was to create conditions conducive to the holding of an early and fair plebiscite, let us see how far India is bound by these resolutions and what international commitments she and her leaders had made in the past to honour their pledge to United Nations, to Pakistan and, above all, to the people of Jammu and Kashmir.*

## PLEBISCITE PLEDGE

In his reply to the Maharaja's letter despatched on 27 October, 1947, Lord Mountbatten, the Governor-General of India, stated on behalf of the Government of India: "Consistently with their policy that in the case of any state where the issue of accession has been the subject of dispute, the question of accession should be decided in accordance with the wishes of the people of the state, it is my Government's wish that as soon as law and order have been restored in Kashmir and her soil cleared of the invader, the question of the State's accession should be settled by a conference of the people."

● ● ●

Perhaps not satisfied with this clarification, Nehru promptly sent a telegram to the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Attlee, in the course of which he said:

"I should like to make it clear that question of aiding Kashmir in this emergency is not designed in any way to influence the State to accede to India. Our view which we have repeatedly made public is that the question of accession in any disputed territory or state must be decided in accordance with the wishes of people and we adhere to this view."

● ● ●

On receiving this telegram, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom sent a clearly-worded message to the High Commissioner of the United Kingdom in Pakistan to be communicated to the Prime Minister of Pakistan:

"I have received message from Prime Minister of India stating that grave situation has developed in Kashmir . . . He adds that he

would like to make it clear that the question of aiding Kashmir in this emergency is not designed in any way to influence the State to accede to India."

Next day, Mr. Nehru despatched the following telegram to Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan :

"I wish to assure you that the action Government of India has taken has been forced upon them by circumstances and imminent and grave danger to Srinagar. They have no desire to intervene in affairs of Kashmir State after raiders have been driven away and law and order established. In regard to accession also it has been made clear that this is subject to reference to the people of State and their decision. Government of India have no desire to impose any decision and will abide by people's wishes but those cannot be ascertained till peace and law and order prevail."

On the last day of October, the same year, the Prime Minister of India despatched yet another telegram to the Prime Minister of Pakistan :

"Kashmir's accession to India was accepted by us at the request of the Maharaja's Government and the most numerous representative popular organization in the State which is predominantly Muslim. Even then it was accepted on condition that as soon as the invader has been driven from Kashmir soil and law and order restored the people of Kashmir would decide the question of accession. It is open to them to accede to either Dominion then. Our assurance that we withdraw our troops from Kashmir as soon as peace and order are restored and leave the decision regarding the future of this State to the people of the State is not merely a pledge to your Government but also to the people of Kashmir and to the world."

Mr. Gandhi visited Srinagar, Kashmir's capital city, for the first time at the age of 77, but the trend of popular opinion forced the Mahatma to declare :

" . . . . . The princes being the creation of British imperialism and the British having quitted India, the people in the States were their own masters and the Kashmiris must, therefore, decide, without any coercion or show of it, from within or without, to which Dominion they should belong."

The White Paper on Kashmir issued by the Government of India in 1948 held out the assurance :

"The question of accession is to be decided finally in a free plebiscite; on this there is no dispute. There will be no victimisation of any native of the State, whatever his political view may be and no Kashmiri will be deprived of the right to vote."

On 15 January, 1948, the leader of the Indian delegation assured the members of the Security Council :

" . . . . . Whether she (Kashmir) should withdraw from her accession to India, and either accede to India or remain independent with a right to claim admission as a member of the United Nations—all this we have recognised to be a matter for unfettered decision by the people of Kashmir after normal life is restored there."

In a broadcast from New Delhi on 2 November, 1947, the Indian Prime Minister said :

" . . . . . We have declared that the fate of Kashmir is ultimately to be decided by the people. That pledge we have given, and the Maharaja has supported it, not only to the people of Kashmir but to the world. We will not and cannot back out of it. We are prepared, when peace and law and order have been established, to have referendum held under international auspices like the United Nations . . . . ."

Again, next day, Mr. Nehru in a telegram to Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan repeated his assurance :

"I wish to draw your attention to broadcast on Kashmir which I made last evening. I have stated our Government's policy and made it clear that we have no desire to impose our will on Kashmir but to leave final decision to people of Kashmir. I further stated that we have agreed to an impartial international agency like United Nations supervising any referendum. As soon as raiders are withdrawn there would be no necessity for our keeping our troops there."

Mr. Nehru reiterated this declaration on 21 November, 1947 :

" . . . . . I have repeatedly stated that as soon as peace and order have been established, the people of Kashmir should decide the question of accession by plebiscite or referendum under international auspices such as those of the United Nations . . . by this declaration I stand."

In the summer of 1951 Maulana Azad, India's Education Minister, said at a Press Conference in Iran :

"The Government of India have declared on more occasions than one, and on their own initiative and without any suggestion from any quarter whatsoever, that the Government of India will respect the wishes of the people of Kashmir . . . Today and always we say that it shall be the people of Kashmir who will decide whether they will remain with us or accede to Pakistan."

Let us recall what Mr. Nehru stated on 26 June 1952 :

We have not got a clear slate to write upon ; we are limited, inhibited by our commitments to the United Nations, by this, by that. But, nevertheless, the basic fact remains that we have declared—and

even if we had not declared the fact would remain—that it is the people of Kashmir who must decide. And I say with all respect to our Constitution that it just does not matter what your Constitution says ; if the people of Kashmir do not want it, it will not go there. Let us suppose there was a proper plebiscite there and the people of Kashmir said, "we do not want to be with India." Well, we are committed to it, we would accept it. It might pain us but we would not send an army against them ; we would accept it, however much hurt we might feel about it, and we should change our Constitution about it.

In another speech in the same vein on 7 August, 1952 Mr. Nehru said :

It is an international problem. It would be an international problem anyhow if it concerned any other nation besides India, and it does. It became further an international problem because a large number of other countries also took an interest and gave advice . . . . . So while the accession was complete in law and in fact, the other fact which has nothing to do with the law also remains, namely, our pledge to the people of Kashmir—if you like, to the people of the world—that this matter can be reaffirmed or cancelled or cut out by the people of Kashmir if they so wish. We do not want to win people against their will and with the help of armed force, and if the people of Jammu and Kashmir State so wish it, to part company from us, they can go their way and we shall go our way. We want no forced marriages, no forced unions like this . . .

So, we accept this basic proposition that this question is going to be decided finally by the goodwill and pleasure of the people of Kashmir, not, I say, by the goodwill and pleasure of even this Parliament if it so chooses, not because this Parliament may not have the strength to decide it—I do not deny that because this Parliament has not only laid down in this particular matter that a certain policy will be pursued in regard to Jammu and Kashmir State but it has been our policy . . .



But whether it is a pain and a torment, if the people of Kashmir want to go out, let them go because we will not keep them against their will however painful it may be to us. That is the policy that India will pursue and because India will pursue that policy people will not leave her, people will cleave to her and come to her. Because the strongest bonds that bind will not be the bonds of your armies or even of your Constitution, to which so much reference has been made, but bonds which are stronger than the Constitution and laws and armies—bonds that bind through love and affection and understanding of various people . . .

On 20 August, 1953, the following press communique was issued in New Delhi by the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan :

"The Kashmir dispute was especially discussed at some length. It was their firm opinion that this should be settled in accordance with the wishes of the people of that State with a view to promoting their well-being and causing the least disturbance to the life of the people of the State. The most feasible method of ascertaining the wishes of the people was by fair and impartial plebiscite. Such a plebiscite had been proposed and agreed to some years ago. Progress, however, could not be made because of lack of agreement in regard to certain preliminary issues. The Prime Ministers agreed that these preliminary issues should be considered by them directly in order to arrive at agreements in regard to this. These agreements would have to be given effect to and the next step would be the appointment of a Plebiscite Administrator."

In a report to the All-India Congress Committee, on 9 July, 1951, Nehru said :

"Kashmir has been wrongly looked upon as a prize for India or Pakistan. People seem to forget that Kashmir is not a commodity for sale or to be bartered. It has an individual existence and its people must be the final arbiters of their future. It is here today that

a struggle is being fought, not in the battle-field but in the minds of men."

In a press statement issued in London on 2 August, 1951, India's Krishna Menon said :

"It is not the intention of the Government of India to go back on any commitment it has made. We adhere strictly to our pledge of plebiscite in Kashmir—a pledge made to the people of Kashmir because they believe in democratic Government . . . . We do not regard Kashmir as a commodity to be trafficked in."

On 3 February, 1948, Gopalaswami Ayyangar, India's Permanent Representative to United Nations told the Security Council :

"As the Security Council is aware, the Government of India is fully committed to the view that, after peace is restored and all people belonging to the State have returned there, a free plebiscite should be taken and the people should decide whether they wish to remain with India, to go over to Pakistan or to remain independent, if they choose to do so."

Addressing the Security Council on 8 February, 1957, India's Krishna Menon said :

"It is possible for any sovereign state to cede territory. If, as a result of plebiscite, if ever it did come, the people decided that they did not want to stay with India, then our duty at that time would be to adopt those constitutional procedures which would enable us to separate that territory."

## APPENDIX IV

*If historical facts and geographic factors ever proved anything, it is that Kashmir belongs as much to West Pakistan as West Pakistan does to Kashmir. They are two parts of one whole; they are inseparable and destined, in the long run, to prosper or perish together. They constitute one compact unit, in which religion and culture, the main roads, the mountain routes and the river courses form a strong pattern of links.*

*For Nehru's daughter, Kashmir may be a question of prestige, a land of sentiment, a thing of beauty, a valley of kinship, a game of power politics but, for all the men, women and children of Pakistan and Kashmir, it is a matter of life and death. In physical terms, West Pakistan without Kashmir, appears like a ship without a deck, a house without a roof and a man without a head.*

*The concluding part of the Appendices is based on an article by Professor S. H. Shah and provides an excellent background of Kashmir's intimate relationship with Pakistan. It is followed by a factual appreciation of the truth which geography, economics and population figures have taught us.*

## PAKISTAN AND KASHMIR

It is a historic truth that Kashmir has never been an integral part of India. From times immemorial Kashmir has been a distinct cultural entity with its own language, culture, ceremonials, artistic values and philosophy of life and religion. Luckily Kashmir has the unique distinction of having a continuous record of its history for the last 2,000 years.

If we just peep into the story of Kashmir's evolution, it will become clear that Kashmir has been and is a part of the areas now included in West Pakistan. No amount of eloquence and verbose jugglery of the Indian propagandists has been able to destroy this eternal image of Kashmir.

Kashmir has throughout the ages been either an independent country or an integral part of Gandhara, the cradle of ancient Naga and Buddhist cultures now forming part of West Pakistan. Her trade routes, cultural and religious exchanges, emigration and immigration of population have all linked it on the one side with central Asiatic regions and on the other with Gandhara that is modern West Pakistan.

During the earliest periods as shown by the prehistoric and proto-historic remains in Northern Regions of West Pakistan and Kashmir, it appears that the aboriginal population of these areas came of a common stock and spoke common dialects described by the ancient Sanskrit purists as the Pisacha tongues of which Shina and Kashmiri are extant even today and philologically are non-Aryan tongues. The early mythological evidence available from the Buddhist lore and traditions of ancient Kashmir enshrined in the Nilamat Puran it is evident that the original inhabitants of Kashmir were a non-Aryan race called Nagas by the Aryans. They were a virile aboriginal stock of population whose most famous seat of culture was Taxila.

Great scientist like Nagarjun, philosophers and linguists like Patanjali and Panani and physicians and surgeons like Charak and Dhanvantri and preachers like Kundan and Asavaghosh were all in one or another way connected with the great seats of learning in Kashmir and Gandhara. The migratory population of Nagas had common settlements in Kashmir, Suvastu or modern Swat, and the areas like Hasan Abdal and Taxila. They were closely connected by religion, race and cultural relations.

The Maha Bhashya, Nilamat Puran and Rajtrangani as well as the accounts of Tara Nath, the Buddhist Tibetan historian, speak highly of the great cultural and economic development of the Naga lands especially in Kashmir.

Kalhana's Rajtrangani, which is essentially a saga of Brahmanical glory, is replete with references to the extermination of Nagas and Buddhists from Kashmir by the politically dominant minority of Brahman chiefs. Kalhana's invectives against "rebellious Nagas" and "Buddhist apostates" very vividly indicate the tempo of Naga resistance against Aryans right down to the 9th century A.D.

When Ashok Maurya who received his early training and education in Taxila, became the emperor he tried to incorporate Kashmir in the Mauryan Empire but very soon realised the impossibility of maintaining Kashmir as a part of the Mauryan Empire. Making a virtue out of a necessity he bestowed it on the Buddhist Sangh.

In the history of ancient Kashmir the Kushana period is rightly regarded as a golden age. The great emperor of ancient Pakistan, Kanishka, incorporated Kashmir in the Gandhara Empire and established an alternate capital at Srinagar. This political union of the two areas resulted in very fruitful relations between the people of the Valley and the people of ancient West Pakistan.

Thus Kashmir became the centre of gravity of Kushana's Empire from Afghanistan to Sinkiang and Hindukush to Central India. The evolution of Mahayan Buddhism under Kanishka was mostly given form in Kashmir and great preachers and writers of

Kashmir spread out in central Asiatic countries and China and went as far as Cambodia.

After the break-up of the Kushana Empire, local dynasties of Kashmir like Loharas and Karkotas captured power. Some of them were Buddhists while others believed in a local form of Saivism. It is interesting to note that all their sacred places were confined to Kashmir, where they had their own Punchtarni and Harmukt Ganga as the substitutes for Tribhuni and the sacred Ganga of India. They never regarded Kashmir as a part of Bharat and always referred to Bharat as a foreign country. Till as late as the 15th century of the Christian era Kashmir maintained complete aloofness from India and not a single instance can be quoted of any political connection during this period between India and Kashmir.

During the 14th century, King Rinchan, a Tibetan adventurer, captured power, embraced Islam and became the first Muslim Sultan of Kashmir. Very soon after his death the crown passed on to Shah Mir, an Afghan adventurer, who belonged to Kunhar in the modern district of Jalalabad. He became the founder of Shah-Miri dynasty, who continued to rule over Kashmir right up to the middle of the 16th century. It was during this period that Syed Ali Hamdani, a Muslim scholar and mystic of Tajikistan began his historical mission of peaceful conversion of Kashmiris to Islam. He established the central missionary headquarters at Khanqah-e-Mualla in the heart of the city of Srinagar, which even today is a place of great religious sanctity for the Muslims of Kashmir.

Syed Ali Hamdani not only changed the religion of the vast majority of Kashmiris but also gave a new shape to the cultural pattern of Kashmir. Kashmir was directly linked with the vital sources of Islamic culture in Central Asia and people in the centuries to follow continued to go out for higher education and trade not to Bharat but to Khurasan, Samarkand, Bokhara, Roh, Kabul and Herat.

In 1579, the independent Sultanate of Kashmir was wiped out by the Mughals after a very tough local resistance. Ultimately

Jalal-ud-Din Akbar pacified the people through the intercession of the great Kashmiri leaders, scholars and mystics like Sheikh Yaqoob Sarfi and Baba Daud Khaki, who agreed to become a part of the Mughal Empire on their own conditions. Though the ruler at Delhi was a Muslim, the accession accepted by Sheikh Yaqoob Sarfi and Baba Daud Khaki was of a limited character. For administrative purposes Kashmir was still recognised to be a part of the Suba of Kabul and not a direct dependency of Delhi. This status of Kashmir continued to 1752 when Kashmir became a part of the Kingdom of Afghanistan under Ahmed Shah Abdali.

The Afghans lost Kashmir in 1819 at the hands of Maharaja Ranjit Singh, the King of Lahore. Even during the life time of Maharaja Ranjit Singh the Muslim nation started the war of liberation of Kashmir when Syed Ahmad Shaheed and Maulana Ismail Shaheed declared that the liberation of Kashmir was the condition precedent for the liberation of the Muslim nation from foreign and alien control.

The resistance against Sikh rule continued in Poonch, Muzaffarabad and the Valley till ultimately the East India Company sold Kashmir to Gulab Singh, the hill chief of Jammu. Both Gulab Singh and his son Ranbir Singh maintained their sovereign status as independent rulers in direct treaty relations with the British Government and for all political matters they dealt with the British Government through the Governor of the Punjab with his seat of Government at Lahore. This position continued up to 1884 when Partap Singh came to throne and was forced to accept British Residency in the State directly under the control of the Political Department of the Government of India.

Maharaja Partap Singh was never fully reconciled to this position. Hari Singh, the last Dogra ruler, was an ardent supporter of the independence of the State of Jammu and Kashmir and as soon as the British rule came to an end he accepted a stand-still agreement with the Government of Pakistan and not with the Government of India. Even after the declaration of independence by the Kashmiris in Muzaffarabad and Poonch when Maharaja Hari Singh lost

control over the situation and was forced under pressure of Acharya Kriplani, Mr. Mehr Chand Mahajan, Swami Satya Deva, the religious preceptor of the Nehrus and Rani Tara Devi, he agreed only to a limited accession with India. That he did not agree to application of the Indian Constitution to the State and insisted on maintaining the independent character of his kingdom is evident from the fact that the Government of India conceded national status of Kashmir by agreeing to the setting up of a Constituent Assembly. Since 1947 Kashmir is internationally recognised as a disputed area, the future of which is to be decided by all canons of justice and international usage by a free and impartial plebiscite supervised by an international agency.

The verdict of history is, therefore, clearly against India. The Kashmiris have to make a choice of their destiny in the light of this historic perspective. That explains why India wants to wriggle out of her solemn promises repeatedly given by her accredited leaders both in and outside the United Nations Organization that the future of Kashmir shall be decided by the Kashmiris themselves. It is vain hope of the Indian imperialists that history can be belied to suit their unbridled ambition.

## LET FACTS SPEAK

The State of Jammu and Kashmir has an area of 84,471 square miles. It is bounded on the north-east by Tibet, on the north by China, on the extreme north-west by Afghanistan where it is also in close proximity with Soviet Russia, on the west and south by West Pakistan and by a perilously narrow hilly tip in the south-east by India.

The State is composed of three units :—

- (1) Jammu Province (topographically and ethnologically part of the plains of West Pakistan).
- (2) Kashmir Valley (Muzaffarabad district of this province has common race, terrain and boundary with Abbottabad, in West Pakistan).

- (3) Frontier districts (Gilgit zone of this unit is flanked on the north-west and west by the Pakistan States of Chitral, Dir and Swat.

The total population of the Jammu and Kashmir State, according to the census figures of 1941, was 4,023,180, Muslims numbering 3,102,700, i.e. 77.11 per cent or more than three-fourths and non-Muslims under a million (920,480), constituting less than one-fourth, i.e. 22.89 per cent only. The distribution of population in the three territorial units of the State is as follows:

		Total population	Muslims
1. Jammu Province :			
Muslims	... 1,215,076	1,981,483	61.3%
Non-Muslims	... 775,575		
2. Kashmir Valley :			
Muslims	... 1,615,478	1,728,705	93.4%
Non-Muslims	... 112,270		
3. Frontier Districts :			
Muslims	... 270,093	311,400	88.9%
Non-Muslims	... 41,381		

Thus there was a Muslim majority in the State as a whole as well as in each administrative division taken singly when, in 1947, the British Indian Empire was partitioned and gave birth to the two successor States of India and Pakistan. Of these Pakistan was the expression of the self-determination of the Muslim majority areas of the subcontinent. Now, the State of Jammu and Kashmir was contiguous to Pakistan; it was as predominantly Muslim as Pakistan itself; its three great rivers, arteries of Kashmir's timber trade, flowed into Pakistan to irrigate its vast agricultural plains; in race, culture, values, food and customs the people of Kashmir and of West Pakistan formed one single homogeneous unit; road communications which in all mountainous countries follow the course of rivers, determined the

course of the Jhelum (the only road leading out of the Kashmir Valley open all the year round) to Rawalpindi in Pakistan and the course of the Chenab (from Jammu to Sialkot). The road connecting Jammu with Srinagar in the Kashmir Valley, which has now been extended through causeways to India, crosses the Pir Panjal range at 10,000 feet high Banihal Pass and is snow-bound for about four months in the year.

In his foreword to a brochure "Economic consequences of Kashmir's present political position," written by Haji Mohammad Abdullah of Srinagar, Mirza Afzal Beg, Sheikh Abdullah's right hand man and founder-president of the Jammu and Kashmir Plebiscite Front, said on 17 January, 1969: "The people of Kashmir have not for the last 21 years been able to enjoy the fruits of freedom. The Jhelum-Valley Road, which linked Kashmir with the outside world, had been blocked, diverting all trade and human traffic to Bannihal Road which is subject to frequent interruptions on account of land-slides both in summer and winter. As against 200 miles of distance between Srinagar and Rawalpindi, the distance between Srinagar and Delhi was nearly 600 miles, of which 200 miles were hilly and hazardous. This fact was fast killing the Kashmir industries of carpet, silk, fruit, shawl and precious metals. The huge cost of transport was making it impossible for Kashmiri producers to face the competitive market prices in the plains and its disastrous consequences were already being felt. The Jhelum river route which was the means of transportation of crores of rupees worth timber from Srinagar to Jhelum town was also blocked since 1947 and the Occupied Kashmir timber had to be transported by land on costly trucks to Pathankot, a distance of nearly 300 miles. The cost of river was not more than two or three annas per cubic feet which had now gone up to Rs. 2.50 per cubic feet."

The agricultural economy of the State of Jammu and Kashmir is based on the forest wealth of its great mountain slopes. Before October, 1947, the timber from these forests was floated down the rivers to its two great markets at Jhelum and Wazirabad in Pakistan. In winter months the Kashmiri workers found employment in the

temperate plains of West Pakistan. Besides, Kashmir's proverbial fresh fruit found their nearest and most practical markets in close-by Rawalpindi in Pakistan, a few hours' drive from the Kashmir Valley. Kashmir's economic links with Pakistan were equally marked in its import trade. Most of Kashmir's requirements in salt, pulses, grain, wool and oil-seeds were met by what is now West Pakistan. Practically all petrol and petroleum products came from the oil-fields of Attock in Pakistan. Karachi is the port nearest to Kashmir and all its trade with foreign countries passed through this city.

The dependence of Pakistan upon the rivers flowing from Kashmir (Indus, Jhelum and Chenab) is too well-known a fact to need any elaboration. Although the Indus Basin agreement appears sufficiently to safeguard Pakistan's interests, so far as equitable distribution of water is concerned, we must ceaselessly remember that as long as India is in control of the valley, it can try to deprive Pakistan of its share of water by building dams upstream. The Indian code of ethics has become a patent in the trade of dealing with men and matters. The issue of Farakka barrage which threatens the economic viability of East Pakistan should serve as an example and a warning. Therefore, Indian control of these three important rivers flowing into Pakistan will continue to raise the gravest apprehensions.

Thus, in 1947, when India and Pakistan came into being, everything pointed to the logical direction of the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to Pakistan: contiguity, ethnic unity, religion (which basically influenced the principle of self-determination and partition of the subcontinent), natural communications, a common river system, economic inter-dependence and, above all, the sovereign will of the people of Kashmir if only it had a chance to express itself.



## A Select Bibliography

- Alexander, Horace, *India Since Cripps* (Penguin, 1944)
- Ambedkar, *Pakistan or Partition of India* (Bombay: Thacker and Company, 1945)
- Ambekar, G. V. and Divekar, V.D., *Documents on China's Relations with South and South-east Asia 1949—1962* (Bombay, 1964)
- Archer, J. C. *The Sikhs* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946)
- Aziz Beg, *Captive Kashmir* (4-N Gulberg, Lahore)
- Aziz Beg, *Pakistan Faces India*, Second Edition (4-N Gulberg, Lahore, 1967)
- Aziz Beg, *Seventeen September Days* (4-N Gulberg, Lahore, 1966)
- Bains, J. S., *India's International Disputes*, A Legal Study (London, 1962)
- Barton, Sir William, *The Princes of India* (London: Nisbet & Co., 1934)
- Bazaz, P. N., *The History of the Struggle for Freedom in Kashmir* (New Delhi, 1954)
- Bazaz, P. N., *Truth about Kashmir* (The Kashmir Democratic Union, 1950)
- Bellow, H. W., *Kashmir and Kashgar*, A Narrative of the Journey of the Embassy to Kashgar in 1873-74 (London, 1875)
- Biddulph, Major J., *Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh* (Calcutta, 1880)
- Birdwood, Lord, *A Continent Decides* (London, 1953)
- Birdwood, Lord, *Two Nations and Kashmir* (London: 1956)
- Bowles, C., *Ambassador's Report* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953)
- Bourke-White, Margaret, *Halfway to Freedom* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1949)
- Brailsford, H. N., *Subject India* (New York: John Day, 1943)

Brecher, M., *The Struggle for Kashmir* (New York : Oxford University Press, 1953)

Brecher, M., *Nehru : A Political Biography* (London : 1959)

Brown, W. Norman, *The United States and India and Pakistan* (Cambridge : Harvard University Press, 1953)

Callard, K., *Pakistan : A Political Study* (London, 1957)

Campbell-Johnson, A., *Mission with Mountbatten* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1953)

Chaudhri Mohammad Ali, *Emergence of Pakistan* (Columbia University Press, 1967)

Colquhoun, Archibald R., *Russia against India* (New York : Harper & Brothers, 1900)

Cooper, Duff, *Old Men Forget* (Hart-Davis, 1953)

Curran, Jr., J. A., *Militant Hinduism in Indian Politics*, A study of the R.S.S. (New York : Institute of Pacific Relations, 1951)

*Cambridge History of India*, ed. by Sir Wolseley Haig. Vol. III, Chapter XII, The Kingdom of Kashmir (New York : The Macmillan Company, 1928)

*Crescent and Green* (Cassell, 1955)

Datta, K. K., *India's March to Freedom* (Calcutta : Orient Longmans)

Davis, Kingsley, *Population of India and Pakistan* (Princeton : Princeton University Press, 1951)

Diver, Maud, *Royal India* (New York : D. Appleton-Century, 1942)

Drew, Frederic, *The Jammu and Kashmir Territories* (London, 1875)

Etherton, P. T., *Across the Roof of the World* (London, 1911)

Ferguson, J. P., *Kashmir : A Historical Introduction* (London, 1961)

Fischer, Louis, *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi* (New York : Harper & Brothers 1950)

Francke, A. H., *History of Western Tibet*

Francis Toker, *While Memory Serves* (London : Cassell & Company Ltd., 1950)

*Foreign Policy of Pakistan* (Karachi : The Allies Book Corporation, 1964)

Gervis, P., *This is Kashmir* (London, 1954)

Griffiths, Sir P., *Modern India* (London, 1965)

Gupta, S., *Kashmir: Issues and Prospects* (India : Quarterly XXI. No. 3, July—September, 1965)

Hafizullah, M., *Towards Azad Kashmir* (Lahore, 1948)

Heber, Dr. and Mrs. A. R., *In Himalayan Tibet*

*India, Pakistan, Ceylon*, edited by W. Norman Brown (Ithaca, N. Y. : Cornell University Press, 1951)

Ismay, Lord, *Memoirs* (London, 1960)

Jamil-ud-Din Ahmad, *Some recent speeches and writings of Mr. Jinnah* (Sh. Mohammad Ashraf, Kashmiri Bazar, Lahore, 1942)

Jansen, G. H., *Afro-Asia and Non-Alignment* (London : Faber & Faber, 1966)

Jones, George E., *Tumult in India* (New York : Dodd, Mead & Co., 1948)

Kak, Ram Chandra, *Ancient Monuments of Kashmir* (London, 1933)

Karaka, D. F., *Betrayal in India* (London : Victor Gollancz, 1950)

Karunakaran, K. P., *India in World Affairs*, August 1947—December 1953 (Bombay, 1958)

Kaula, P. N., *Kashmir Speaks* (Delhi, 1950)

Korbel, J., *Danger in Kashmir* (Princeton, 1954)

Knight, E. F., *Where Three Empires Meet* (London, 1893)

Krishen, Rajbans, *Kashmir and the Conspiracy against Peace* (Bombay : People's Publishing House Ltd., 1951)

Lamb, A., *The China-India Border : The Origins of the Disputed Boundaries* (London, 1954)

Lamb, A., *Crisis in Kashmir (1947—1966)* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966)

Lawrence, Sir Walter, *The Valley of Kashmir* (London, 1895)

Lawrence, Sir Walter, *The India We Served* (New York : Houghton Mifflin, 1929)



Mahajan, M. C., *Looking Back* (London, 1963)

Martin Laurence W. Martin, *Neutralism and Nonalignment*

Massani, *Britain in India* (Oxford, 1961)

Mason, Kenneth, *Abode of Snow* (London, 1955)

Mellor, Andrew, *India since Partition* (New York : Frederick A. Praeger, 1951)

Menon, V. P., *The Story of the Integration of the Indian States* (London, 1956)

Menon, V. P., *The Transfer of Power in India* (London, 1957)

Mohammad Ayub Khan (President of Pakistan), *Friends Not Masters, a Political Autobiography* (Oxford University Press, 1967)

M. M. R. Khan, *The United Nations and Kashmir* (Groningen, Djakarta, 1955)

Moreland, W. H., and Chatterjee, A.C., *A Short History of India*, second edition (New York : Longmans Green & Company, 1945)

Mosley, L., *The Last Days of the British Raj*, (Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1964)

Munshi, K. M., *The End of an Era* (Bombay : Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan)

Muehl, John Fr., *Interview with India* (New York : John Day, 1950)

Mushtaq Ahmad, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy* (Karachi, Space Publishers, 1968)

De Mahaffe, *Road to Kashmir* (Lahore, Ripon Printing Press)

De Montmorency, Sir Geoffrey, *The Indian States and Indian Federation* (Cambridge University Press, 1942)

Neve, Dr. Arthur, *Thirty Years in Kashmir* (London, 1913)

Neve, Dr. Ernest, *Beyond the Pir Panjal* (London, 1915)

Nicholls, J. H., *Mughal Gardens of Kashmir* (London)

Noorani, A. G., *The Kashmir Question* (Bombay, 1962)

Parkin, Raleigh, *India Today* (New York : John Day, 1946)

Panikkar, K. M., *The Founding of the Kashmir State: A Biography of Maharaja Gulab Singh 1792—1858* (London, 1953)

Pirthvi Nath Kaula, *Kashmir Speaks* (London, 1950)

Prasad, Beni, *India : Hindu-Muslim Questions* (London, George Allen & Unwin, 1946)

Prasad, Rajendra, *India Divided* (Bombay : Hind Kitabs, 1947)

Pyarelal, *Mahatma Gandhi : The Last Phase Vols. I and II* (Ahmedabad : Navajiran Publishing House)

Pakistan, *The Heart of Asia, Speeches by Liaquat Ali Khan* (Cambridge : Harvard University Press, 1950)

Rajan, M. S., *India in World Affairs 1954—56* (Bombay, 1964)

Rajput, A. B., *Muslim League Yesterday and Today* (Lahore, Mohammad Ashraf)

Raman, T. A., *Report on India* (London : Oxford University Press, 1943)

Rao, G. V. Subba, *The Partition of India* (India : Goshti Book Trust)

Rawlinson, H. G., *India: A Short Cultural History* (New York : D. Appleton-Century, 1938)

Russell, Wilfred, *Indian Summer* (Thacker, Bombay)

Saiyid, M. H., *Mohammad Ali Jinnah : A Political Study* (Lahore : Ashraf Press 1945)

Sapru, Arjun Nath, *The Building of the Jammu and Kashmir State* (Lahore : 1931)

Sardar M. Ibrahim Khan, *The Kashmir Saga* (Lahore, 1965)

Sarwar Hasan, *Pakistan and the United Nations*, (Manhattan Publishing Company, New York, 1960)

Schmid, Peter, *India: Mirage and Reality* (George G. Harrap and Co. Ltd., London, 1961)

Sheean, Vincent, *Nehru* (Gollancz, 1961)

Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, *Kashmir, India and Pakistan* (Foreign Affairs, April, 1965)

Sherwani, *India, China and Pakistan* (Karachi, Council for Pakistan Studies, 1964)

Sinha, Dr. S., *Kashmir: The Playground of Asia* (Allahabad, 1943)

- Smith, Wilfred C., *Modern Islam in India; Second edition* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1946)
- Smith, D. E., *India as a Secular State* (Princeton: 1963)
- Smith, William Roy, *Nationalism and Reform in India* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938)
- Spear, Percival, *India, Pakistan and the West* (New York: Oxford Press, 1949)
- Spear, T. G. P., *A History of India, Vol. 2* (London, 1965)
- Stephens, I., *Horned Moon* (London, 1953)
- Stephens, I., *Pakistan* (London, 1963)
- Stuart, Mrs. C. M. Villiers, *Gardens of the Great Mughals* (London, 1913)
- Sufi, G. M. D., *Islamic Culture in Kashmir* (Simla: The Army Press, 1925)
- Symonds, R., *The Making of Pakistan* (London, 1950)
- Temple, Sir Richard and Captain R. S. Temple, *Journals kept in Hyderabad, Kashmir, Sikkim and Nepal* (London, 1887)
- The Kashmir Question* (Karachi, Pakistan Institute of International Affairs, 1966)
- Thompson, Edward, *The Making of the Indian Princes* (London: Oxford University Press, 1943)
- Time Only to Look Forward: Speeches by Rear Admiral the Earl Mountbatten of Burma* (London, Nicholas Kaye, 1949)
- Tinker, H., *India and Pakistan, A Short Political Guide* (London, 1962)
- Torrens, Lt. Col., *Travels in Ladak, Tartary and Kashmir* (London, 1863)
- Tuzuk-i-Jahangiri or Memoirs of Jahangir*, Translated by A. Rogers, edited by H. Beveridge, two volumes (London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1914)
- Tyndale-Biscoe, C. E., *Kashmir in Sunlight and Shade* (London, 1922)
- Vairanapillai, M. S., *Are We Two Nations?* (Lahore: Herbert Milton Williams, 1946)
- Wallbank, T. Walker, *India in the New Era* (Chicago, Scott, Foresman, 1951)

- Wilber, D. N., (ed.) *Pakistan: Its People, its Society, its Culture* (New Haven, 1964)
- Wilson, A., *The Abode of Snow* (London, 1875)
- Woodruff, Philip, *The Men Who Ruled India*, 2 vols. (Jonathan Cape)
- Younghusband, Sir Francis E., *Kashmir* (London, A. and C. Black, 1909)
- Younghusband, Sir Francis E., *Kashmir* (London, 1917)
- Zinkin, T., *Challenges in India* (London, Chatto & Windus, 1966)

## DOCUMENTS AND PAMPHLETS

- India's Threat to Pakistan* (Correspondence between the Prime Ministers of Pakistan and India: 15th July—11th August, 1951. White Paper)
- India's War Propaganda Against Pakistan* (Ministry of Interior, Information and Broadcasting, Government of Pakistan)
- Khan, Sardar Mohammad Ibrahim, *Kashmir and the United Nations*
- No-War Declaration and Canal Waters Dispute: Correspondence between the Prime Ministers of Pakistan and India* (Superintendent, Government Printing and Stationery, Sind, Karachi)
- Inside Kashmir* (Superintendent, Government Printing, Lahore, West Punjab 1948)
- Kashmir Before Accession* (Superintendent, Government Printing, Lahore, West Punjab, 1948)
- Kashmir Liberation Movement* (Kashmir Publications, Muzaffarabad, Azad Kashmir, June, 1959)
- Note on the Sikh Plan* (Superintendent, Government Printing, Lahore, West Punjab, 1948)
- The Sikhs in Action*, (Superintendent, Government Printing, Lahore, West Punjab, 1948)
- Tashkent Declaration*, Altaf Gauhar (Pakistan Publications, Karachi, March, 1966)
- Government of India, *White Paper on Jammu and Kashmir* (New Delhi, 1948)
- Government of India, *Aggression in Kashmir* (New Delhi, 1963)

- Government of India, *Notes, Memoranda and Letters exchanged between the Governments of India and China, July 1963 to January 1964* (White Paper No. X, New Delhi, 1964)
- Government of India, *Notes, Memoranda and Letters exchanged between the Governments of India and China, January 1964 to January 1965* (White Paper No. XI, New Delhi, 1965)
- Government of India, *Who is the Aggressor?* (New Delhi, 1965)
- Government of India, *The Paradox of India-Pakistan Relations*, (New Delhi, 1965)
- Government of India, *Harvest of Glory* (New Delhi, 1966)
- Jammu and Kashmir, *Government of Jammu and Kashmir 1947—1950* (An account of the activities of the first three years of Sheikh Abdullah's Government, Jammu 1951)
- Lakhanpal, P. L., *Essential Documents and Notes on Kashmir Dispute* (Delhi, 1965)
- Government of Pakistan, *Verdict on Kashmir* (Being an account of the Security Council Debate from 21 February to 2 April 1951, Karachi, 1951)
- Government of Pakistan, *The Story of Kashmir* (Karachi, 1951)
- Government of Pakistan, *Negotiations between the Prime Ministers of Pakistan and India regarding the Kashmir Dispute*, June 1953—September 1954 (Karachi, 1954)
- Government of Pakistan, *Kashmir in Maps* (Rawalpindi, 1954)
- Government of Pakistan, *The Kashmir Issue* (Statement to the Press by Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, Karachi 1958)
- Government of Pakistan, *Kashmir Documents* (Karachi, 1962)
- Government of Pakistan, *Reports on Kashmir by United Nations Representatives* (Karachi, 1962)
- Government of Pakistan, *Kashmir* (Speech delivered to the Security Council on 11 May, 1964, by Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, Minister for External Affairs, Government of Pakistan, Karachi, 1964)
- Government of Pakistan, *Speeches before the United Nations General Assembly, 1957—1965*, by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, Foreign Minister of Pakistan, (Karachi, 1965)
- Government of Pakistan, *President Ayub on the Crisis over Kashmir* (Karachi, 1965)
- Government of Pakistan, *Pakistan Repels Aggression* (Rawalpindi, 1966)